HĀSYA AND PRAHASANA

A CRITICAL STUDY

Dr. SURAM SRINIVASULU

HĀSYA AND PRAHASANA

A CRITICAL STUDY

Dr. SURAM SRINIVASULU

Hāsya And Prahasana: A Critical Study

A part of the thesis, awarded the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
by Andhra University, Waltair in 1986

First Impression: May 1989

Second Impression: May 2025 (e-book)

For Copies:
Dr. Suram Srinivasulu
9440242348
e-mail: srinivasulu.suram@gmail.com

Design:
Vittu Babu, Hyderabad
Ph: 8555082034

I am indebted to

Sri A. Someswara Sarma, M.A., Reader (Retd.) Andhra University, Waltair, who had been the Director to me until his retirement,

Sri P. Srirama Murthy, M.A., Ph.D., Professor, Department of Sanskrit, Andhra University, Waltair, for accepting to guide me after the retirement of Sri A. Someswara Sarma and guiding me with kind co-operation,

Sri N. S. Krishnamurthy, Advocate, Nellore, for his suggestions after verifying some of the chapters of my thesis,

Dr. T. Ramakrishnamurthy, M. A., Ph. D., Sri K. V. Subba Reddy, M. A., Smt S. B. I. Satyavathi, M. A., Sri 1. Madhava Rao, M. A., Sri S. M. S. Bhanu Prasad, M. A., for their co-operation in preparing the fair copies of the thesis,

the Correspondent (Present: Vidwan Sri Gogineni Kanakaiah) S. G. K. Oriental College, Tadikonda, for permitting me to submit my thesis for Ph. D. Degree,

Sri Prabala Subrahmanyam, Lecturer, Gautami Vidyapeetham, Rajahmundry, who helped in getting certain Prahasanas copied from the Gautami Library, Rajahmundry.

Chi. T. Sanjeeva Rao and Chi. Ch. P. Satyanarayana for their co-operation in getting Prahasanas copied from Adayar Library, Madras and Oriental Manuscript Library, Madras and Kendriya Samskṛta Vidyapeetham, Tirupathi respectively,

Sri G. V. Narasaiah, M. A., Who has extended co-operation in preparing Press Copy,

the Telugu University, Hyderabad, A. P. who sanctioned Rs. 5000-00 to bring out my thesis.

the authorities of Andhra University for permitting me to get the book printed,

and one and all known or unknown who co-operated in preparing and submitting the thesis. - Author

Vidwan **Sri G. Kanakaiah**
President
Tadikonda Educational Institutions
3rd Line, Lakshmipuram
GUNTUR-7

FOREWORD

Dr. Suram Srinivasulu, an able scholar, Proficient in Sanskrit and Telugu hails from Nellore. He had worked in Oriental Colleges at Eluru and Ponnuru before he took charge as the Principal of S. G. K. Oriental College, Tadikonda. Apart from his brilliant academic career, Dr. Suram is an adept 'AVADHAANI'. He has more than a hundred 'Astaavadhaanams' to his credit. As an author too, he is well known, having written a number of books of literary and critical value. He has won the 'Best teacher' award from the State Government in 1981.

The present work "Haasya and Prahasana: A critical study" is a dissertation submitted by the author to Andhra University for Ph. D. The University has recognised his talent and awarded him the much-coveted Doctorate.

Perhaps Bhagawan has willed; thus, Dr. Srinivasulu dedicates this valuable work to me. I am pleased and delighted to receive such a rare honour as this, and I thank him heartily for the affection showed on me.

I pray to Bhagawan Sri Satyasai to bless the author in all his future endeavours.

with affection
G. Kanakaiah

Humbly Dedicated

to

My Venerable Employer

Well Wisher, Philosopher

and

Guide

Vidwan SRI GOGINENI KANAKAIAH

The Philanthropist of Tadikonda

About the Dedicatee...

Born in a respected family at Tadikonda on 4th January 1917, Sri Gogineni Kanakaiah from his early boy- hood was attracted towards literature. He received Vidwan title from Madras University in recognition of his proficiency in Sanskrit and Telugu.

As he grew up Sri Kanakaiah has his ideals clear. He yearned to do his best to his native village especially in the field of Education and Medicine which are primary needs to human beings, thus with his incessant and selfless work, Sri Vellanki Venkatappaiah High School (named after the father of the chief donor Smt. M Ratnamma) was started in 1946.

He has established GKLF Dispensary in Tandikonda It has become a Rural Health Centre later and is now useful as a training centre to the students of Guntur Medical College.

With his firm will Sri Kanakaiah has founded many educational institutions in Tadikonda - from an Elementary School to a Degree College. Thery are being run efficiently with his help and guidance He has started an Oriental College (1968) in his name and a Girls' High School (1977) in the name of his wife Smt. Venkayamma. With the blessings of Bhagawan "Sri Satya Sai Vidyalayam", a Junior College and a Degree College both in the name of Bhagawan are established and being run efficiently. Besides recognition, the colleges have Government grant-in-aid.

Sri Kanakaiah played an important role in founding Nagarjuna Education Society in Guntur and started JKC College (197). He has started in the name of his brother-in- law RVR Education College, and RVR & JCU P Engineering College. All the institution are being run ably. He has advised, guided and assisted many educational institutions in other places too and they are also being run creditably.

Sri Kanakaiah did his best and utmost to enhance the respect and prestige of his native place Tadikonda. The First Andhra Pradesh Residential School for six districts was started here and achieved name and fame with its wonderful results. A Regional Camping Centre with all facilities established here for Scouts and Guides shows the big heart of Sri Kanakaiah.

Right from the beginning of his life, Sri Kanakaiah showed a spiritual bent of mind. He considered humanitarian values nobler than other things. His selfless work and devotion took him several times to Bhagawan Sri Satya Sai Baba who gave him His blessings. Inspired and influenced by his sacred teachings Sri Kanakaiah has been instrumental in spreading Baba's thoughts and work among students, teachers, scholars and laymen.

Struck by his simplicity, charmed by his love, selfless service and philanthropy, I consider it my good fortune to dedicate this work to Sri Kanakaiah. I feel that our lord Sri Satya Sai has willed it. I express my humble gratitude to Sri Kanakaiah for accepting this trifle and blessing me.

- Suram Srinivasulu

INDEX

			Pages From - To
PART – I	PREFACE	…	11 - 18
	Hāsa	...	19 - 40
	Hāsya	…	41 - 74
	Comic Elements in Sanskrit Literature	…	75 - 100
	Prahasana – Theory	…	101 - 138
PART - II	PRAHASANAS		
	Farce	…	139 - 174
	Comedy of Humours	…	175 - 190
	Comedy of Manners	…	191 - 202
	Domestic Comedy	…	203 - 220
	Satire	…	221 - 236
	Parody	…	237 - 250
	Miscellaneous Types of Prahasana	…	251 - 266
	Conclusion	…	267 - 274
APPENDIX – I	Bibliography of Prahasana	…	275 - 290
APPENDIX – II	Select Bibliography	…	291 – 298

PREFACE

"The size of a man's understanding may be justly measured by his mirth" said Dr. Johnson, the well-known critic and lexicographer. By this very statement one can easily estimate the place of mirth in one's life in response to wit and humour. As a matter of fact, the creation of this universe is also causing *Hāsya* with many an absurdity, incongruity and impropriety, which are taken as the basic elements of *Hāsya.* Indian Philosophers have already acknowledged the significance of such creation and declared that the creation is nothing but the *Leela* of the God. But the existence of such remarkable *Hāsya* has become a controversy in Sanskrit literature. It is obviously difficult to determine whether the nourishment of *Hāsya* is well done or not in Sanskrit literature.

If we are to state that the importance of *Hāsya* is neither ignored nor neglected by Sanskrit critics, there are some technical reasons in favour of us such as; the *Hāsya* is admitted as one of the nine permanent moods in rhetorics; all the rhetoricians right from Bharata have dealt with the *Hāsya* in detail with its divisions; a particular classification like *Aatmastha* and *Parastha* absent in any other sentiment is shown in the case of *Hāsya*; *Hāsya* is made the main sentiment in some divisions and sub-divisions of Sanskrit drama, like the *Bhāṇa*, the *Prahasana* etc., where as many sentiments like *Bībhatsa, Adbhuta* etc., are not offered the chief place in any of the type of Sanskrit drama and it is associated with *Sṛngāra* in almost all dramas except a few in which *Karuṇa, Vīra* etc., are the main sentiments.

Then where is the necessity of talking about the absence of the sentiment *Hāsya* in Sanskrit literature? If anyone is inclined to say so what are his reasons and how far are they valid? If such arguments do not hold water what is the truth? These questions demand our endeavour and concentration. Let us first discuss the critics' hypotheses in this regard

Critics like Bharata have stated that only ladies, children and vile persons are supposed to be the spectators of *Hāsya*. Abhinavagupta says that ladies, children and foolish people are entertained by *Anka, Prahasana* and *Bhāna,* Thus Abhinavagupta is also in support of

Bharata. Now it is debatable as to what made Abhinavagupta the noble critic consider the *Prahasana* in which *Hāsya* is the main sentiment, too low.

Literature is intended not only to derive the aesthetic experience but to attain the four human goals i.e., *Dharma, Artha, Kāma* and *Mokṣa* represented by the sentiments *Vīra, Raudra, Sṛngāra* and *Ṡānta* respectively. Therefore, Abhinavagupta has associated not only the *Hāsya* in the name of *Prahasana* with ladies, children and fools but also the *Karuṇa* and the *Adbhuta* with the same spectators. Bharata has associated only *Hāsya* with spectators of inferior taste, whereas Abhinavagupta has associated *Añka* and *Bhāna* which mainly deal with the *Karuṇa* and the *Adbhuta* with them. Hence it is clear that Abhinavagupta is not impartial to *Hāsya* but he let the *Hāsya*, the *Karuṇa* and the *Adbhuta* sail in the same boat. But he might have thought that the *Hāsya* is seen only in low characters due to the ill-decorum, situated, for he says-

अनौचित्य प्रवृत्ति कृतमेव हि हास्यविभावत्वम् ।

If such *Hāsya* is the main *Rasa* in a poem, the hero of that poem should be a low character. But the Sanskrit poets were and are all interested in making the noble and the gentle as the heroes of their poems. They are very particular in this regard and never allow a low type character as the hero of their Poem. It may be one of the reasons for the lack of the *Hāsya* in Sanskrit literature, especially in poems.

Both the Eastern and Western Critics are of the same opinion. Aristotle in his "Poetics" says "Comedy is an imitation of characters of a low-type, not however in full sense of the word bad, the ludicrous being merely a sub-division of the ugly. It consists in some defect or ugliness which is not painful or destructive.

(Poetics - Bucher's translation P-21)

Some says that the writers on Poetics have not given proper examples to the *Hāsya* while treating them in their works. There may be one or two critics who have not paid much attention to give proper examples, but this should be debited to the individual account of the poet but not to the common account of Literature as Yāska says 'सैषा पुरुष गर्हा भवति ।'. Moreover, they are correct in their doctrine

because they have classified the comic into six types, though they considered two of those lowest.

I am sure, the poet alone is not responsible for the absence of any sentiment in any type of literature, the tradition of that particular literature, the society or the environments and the personal likes and dislikes of the poet and the influence of the age in which he lived ought to be taken into consideration. Many modern critics express their feeling that Sanskrit poets, though they have impressed one and all with their sense of humour in their regular lives have not given proper importance to wit and humour in their works. We accept the above observation, but we want to make it clear that the part played by the poets in this connection is very little. The tradition of Sanskrit literature and the taste of the readers also bear equal responsibility in this regard.

The scope of Sanskrit literature is very extensive. Though the Vedic literature entertains our hearts by its fragments of the comic here and there, it is not at all intended to tickle us. It praises the deities describe their supremacy and bravery and exhorts mortals to ennoble their likes. However, an ideal and authoritative work of certain race and culture which has an exalted place in the world literature should not be viewed with reference to *Hāsya* alone. It is futile to search for the *Hāsya* in a treatise on Sasrtas as there could not be any possibility of entertaining such lighter sentiments in them.

Certain description in Kavyas like *Udyānavihāra, Madhupāna, Ratotsava* and *Salilakrīḍa* have comic sentiment in them. Yet this is overshadowed by the poet's zeal for the ornate and their fondness in employing Figures of Speech. We should not forget in this context, the critics' dictum that a *Mahākāvya* should have all the nine sentiments.

If we think that the comic in *Mahākāvya* is of very little importance, it is due to the absence of the dramaturgy in them. The poet plays a key role in any *Mahākāvya.* The number of conversations between the characters is of very little on one hand and on the other they are lengthy. Wit generally depends on the dialogues between accomplished characters before elite spectators or readers, of course the comic can

also be expressed descriptively and fictionally. Moreover, it requires a particular fiction or description. It may not be possible in a *Mahākāvya.*

Most of the elements of *Hāsya* are improper, incongruous, ridiculous and absurd. Any literature intended to represent noble ideas cannot give place to impropriety, since it destroys the decency of those ideas. The *Mahākāvya* in Sanskrit generally represents the noble models but at times they showed a glimpse of *Hāsya*. Ex 1. The conversation between Parvati and Siva disguised as bachelor in Kalidasa's *Kumārasambhava*. 2. Nala's entrance into the palace of Damayanti with *Śambara* in Sriharsha's *Naiṣadha kāvya.*

Our predecessors have not dealt with the *Hāsya* in the right way and contemporaries did no better. No comic work has so far received the Noble prize. The critics, while enumerating the best works are keeping away the comic-oriented literature. In this connection, we are not justified in mocking at our forefathers. Even a drama, a novel, a film-show or a story in which *Hāsya* is the main sentiment, is not being accepted to compete with other works for an award. If at all accepted, it fails to bag the award for its inability to compete with the other sentiments. It appears that, *Hāsya* is denied a status at par with other main Rasās. Society itself is giving a second-rate importance to the comic-oriented literature. See the judgement of Mathew Arnold in classifying poets, in the words of A. C. Cuddon, "Mathew Arnold", he says "would not allow Chaucer and Pope on his list of the greatest poets, because of their wittiness and lack of higher seriousness. T. S. Eliot adjusted the balance by preferring witty poets like John Donne, Marvell because they were able to combine wit with seriousness. The majority of modern critics agree with Eliot."

(A Dictionary of Literary Terms P. 739)

If that, what the critics think is right, who will venture to compose comic-oriented works and be branded a second-rate poet? Jeevanyaaya Teertha confirms this as fallows

प्रहसनं नाम किञ्चिल्लघु साहित्यम्। पलाश तरोरिव यस्य रचनया न ज्ञान काण्ड गौरवं न वा यशः पुष्प सौरभं प्रकटीकृतं भवेत् । अतो ममेवं समीहा किञ्चित् कारणान्तरमवेक्षमाणा परिस्फुरति । तच्च कारणं बहुजन प्रचार प्रसिद्धायाः मृतभाषायाः अद्यापि हास्य स्फुरणं भवतीति ।

Thus, the society should be held responsible for discoursing poets in their endeavour to produce comic-oriented literature, in any language and particularly in Sanskrit. There is no instance in literature when a comic-poet or play-wright has acquired renown and fame and influenced his contemporaries. Nor is there any era or school to be remarked as the age of *Hāsya* or school of a certain famous comic-poet. It seems that the comic writers are like the transient bubbles on the current of literature.

The *Hāsya* in satire can't but die immediately after the purgation of the social evils, that were exposed in the Satires. Granville Barkar says that wits are like the dried sticks that help to lit fire in the oven. The fire rises up for a while but cools immediately. Rosalin in Loves Labours Lost' of Shakespear disposes that the fate of a joke is based upon the ear of a listener, but not in the mouth of a speaker. No doubt, some individual flaws like the movements of *Vidūṣaka* in Sanskrit drama create some humour, however, provokes wrath in some others, as it accuses some individual or a tradition or a theory.

Sublimity is certainly a venture. But wit and humour need not be looked down upon. Yet the society is wont to consider a man of high seriousness superior to one of a lighter disposition. It is ridiculous that sometimes one's personal gravity even hides one's demerits. That is why perhaps the rhetoricians have made the comedian a secondary or a supporting character only.

Dr. Johnson criticising the character of Falstaff in Henry IV of Shakespeare says that a comedian is always dangerous and he should be kept far. The same has forced Henry IV to punish Falstaff after getting adorned with the crown. We see many characters in the works of *Bhāsa* who say that अहो हास्य मभिधानम् and explain the laughability of that but do not laugh. *Bhāsa* does not allow his characters to laugh.

Classical literature in Sanskrit is mainly erotic. A comedian is not at all a suitable character to contribute or provoke *Sṛngāra* and that is why the *Sṛngāra* in comedians like *Vidūṣaka, Viṭa, Śakāra* etc, has become false provoking the *Hāsya* only. Even the foreign critics are of the same opinion. Let us see the character of Fallstaff

both in Henry IV and Merry Wive of Windsor of Shakespeare. In Henry IV he is a comedian. Shakespeare, requested by Queen Elizabeth made Fallstaff the hero of an erotic drama. But the character proved a miserable failure in love and lust. Thus, Shakespeare has shown that a comedian is not at all suitable for an erotic play. Similarly Sanskrit literature has harped on eroticism and the comic is not given suitable place.

Last but not the least, Sanskrit has lost its importance as a spoken language and that is mainly responsible for the retardation of the *Hāsya*. In the literature of many languages, the infant stage seems to be tragic-oriented, in other words not comic-oriented. In early Greek literature tragedies were playing the main role to attract the spectators better than comedies. There were flashes of humour like Spoonerism, Malapropism etc, which are named after Spooner, a dean and warden of New College, Oxford from 1824 to 1930 and Malaprop, a character in 'The Rivals' of Sheriden. They are derived from a particular way of speaking English.

These are the reasons for the stunted growth of the *Hāsya* in Sanskrit. But, as a matter of fact, Sanskrit literature has not avoided the comic and besides it is sufficiently equipped with it. But the development is left unrecognised due to the non-propagation of Sanskrit literature with timely offers. If we go through the Prahasana literature, we can conclude that Sanskrit literature is also enriched with the sense of humour. But, it is yet to be improved with modern trends and outlook by which the *Hāsya* in Sanskrit should not be less than the *Hāsya* in any other language or literature.

Thus, during my study of the actual position of *Hāsya* in Sanskrit Prahasanas, I followed the classification of the comedy of Western critics due to the reasons specified there itself. I tried to give a brief note of the *Hāsya* in Sanskrit literature through the ages starting from Ṛgveda. I have gone through the classical dramas only as they have patronised the *Hāsya* mainly. (ref. chapter III).

HĀSA

The psychology of human beings with its actions and reactions is very much complicated and interesting. Among the innumerable psychological responses to stimuli only two are given the utmost importance in human life, namely *Sukha* and *Duhkha*, the physical expressions of which are *Hasana*, to laugh and *Rodana*, to lament. Though most of the creatures in this universe are capable of mourning, only a limited number are blessed with the boon of laughing, and of these, human race is the predominant.

The human beings naturally laugh at certain things, incidents, consequences of certain deeds and even at certain thoughts and words and peculiar gestures.

We do not laugh at certain things though they appear odd. For instance, a crippled man limping doesn't provoke laughter in the onlooker. But a person who feigns lameness, does. Thus imitation, not genuineness rouses laughter in us. Take another example, if a cyclist going very speedily falls off from the bicycle, we laugh. But if the person is injured or the cycle is damaged our laughter vanishes at once and we show sympathy to him. So, the result of that particular incident is important. Thus, though *Hāsa* is one of the *Anubhāvās* of *Sukha* laughableness doesn't always mean *Sukha* but a peculiar state. But it is too difficult to list out all the laughable things, situations and consequences of deeds in this temporal world. It is more difficult in the case of *Hāsa*. So, it is easier to experience laughter than to define it. But let me try to define and explain Hāsa as propounded by eastern critics.

There is a legend given by Śāradātanaya in his Bhāvaprakāśana explaining the origin of laughter.

जटाजिनधरो भोगिभूषणः साग्निलोचनः ।
भस्माङ्गरागश्च यदा देव्या कामयते रतिम् ॥
तदा सखीनां देव्याश्च हास स्समुदभून्महान् ।[1]

Lord Siva desired to woo Pārvati and presented himself before her with matted locks, serpents around the neck, dressed in doeskin, ash smeared all over the body and with the unique third eye emitting fire. Siva appeared perhaps, ridiculous and incongruous to Pārvati. Pārvati and her servant maids laughed at him. Why did the action of Śiva here result in the laughter of Pārvati and her maids? If we see a man with serpents, we are generally afraid. We do not laugh. The same must have been the case with Pārvati and her servant maids also. But that was not so. So, we have to move further and think over the matter.

The appearance of Lord Śiva with locks and doeskin, ash smeared on his body and his unique third eye might have tickled them to laugh at him. The above description of Śiva shows some sort of *Vikṛti* in his physical appearance though he was in love. In fact, a man desiring the company of a lady has to properly present himself and be in high spirits in order to attract her. But Śiva had a different decoration for a different mood. So, the Vikṛti i.e. incompatibility that appeared between the physical form and psychological mood in Lord Śiva made Pārvati and her servant maids laugh. More over his imitation of a typical lover might have caused the laughter.

Though the legend is not given by Bharata, he is the first eastern critic to define *Hāsa* as a *Sthāyi* to *Hāsya*. Then what is *Hāsa*?

Bharata defined and explained *Hāsa* as :-

परचेष्टानुकरणाद्धास स्समुपजायते ।
हासो नाम परचेष्टानुकरण, कुहकासम्बद्धप्रलाप,
पौरोभाग्य, मौरख्यादिभिः विभावैस्समुत्पद्यते ।[2]

The above verse of Bharata clearly says that imitation of one's movements and actions is the root of *Hāsa*. Here we must carefully

observe the statement of Bharata as there are three types of imitations given by Bharata himself.

While describing the *Hāsya Rasa,* Bharata says that

शृङ्गारानुकृति र्या तु स हास्यस्तु प्रकीर्तितः । [3]

So Bharata is of the opinion that the imitation of *Sṛngāra* is *Hāsya*. But Abhinavagupta while commenting on this verse says that the imitation of all other sentiments like *Karuṇa* etc., also lead to *Hāsya*.

Moreover, while explaining the nature and characteristics of *Nāṭya*, in the first chapter of *Nāṭya Ṣāstra* says as-

नानाभावोपसम्पन्नं नानावस्थान्तरात्मकम् ।[4]
लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यमेत न्मया कृतम् ॥ …
सप्तद्वीपानुकरणं नाट्यमेतद्भविष्यति । [5]

In the above two verses Bharata ascertained that imitation is the Key Point of a drama. If we analyse the word Anukaraṇa used in three different sequences i.e. in the definition of *Hāsa, Hāsya* and *Naṭya* then the entire dramatic literature or dramaturgy becomes laughable. Bharata might not have supposed like that. So, at the very beginning of our discussion we have to develop a clear-cut meaning of the word *Anukaraṇa* (imitation).

While commenting on the verse of Bharata, Abhinavagupta explains that -

सप्तद्वीपानुकरणमयी क्रिया (नाट्य क्रिया) रङ्ग दृश्यते । न च सागरादीनां कश्चित्तत्र सम्भवः ॥ [6]

So, by imitation Abhinavagupta means the imitation of the actions of the things only but not of the things themselves like the seas and mountains. At this juncture we have to remember that the

Rasa theory of imitation is mercilessly condemned by Bhaṭṭatota, the teacher of Abhinavagupta, who has proved the incongruity of the term imitation. If we simply say that Anukaraṇa is just 'doing after', then the entire universe has to become either a drama or *Hāsa*, because imitation pervades all over the universe. So to come to a conclusion, we have to deal with the commentary of Abhinavagupta on the one hundred and seventh verse of Bharata, in the first chapter of *Nāṭya Śāstra* which reads as :-

नैकान्ततोऽत्र भवतां देवानाञ्चानुकीर्तनम् ।
तैलोक्यस्यास्य सर्वस्य नाट्यं भावानुकीर्तनम् । [7]

Here, Abhinavagupta explains the supremacy of *Anubhāvana* denying its equality with all other worldly substances, in the following manner.

न देवानामसुराणामेकान्तेनानुभावनम् । नैव तेऽनुभाव्यन्ते केनचित्प्रकारेण । तथाहि - तेषु न तत्वेन धीः । न सादृश्येन यमलकवत् । न भ्रान्तत्वेन रूप्यस्मृतिपूर्वक शुक्तिरूप्यवत् । नारोपेण सम्यग्ज्ञान वाधानन्तरमिथ्या ज्ञान रूपम् । न तदध्यवसायेन गोर्वाहीकवत् । नोत्प्रेक्ष्यमाणत्वेन चन्द्रमुखवत् । न तत्प्रतिकृतित्वेन चित्रपुस्तवत् । न तदनुकारेण गुरुशिष्य व्याख्याहेवाकवत् । न तात्कालिक निर्माणेन इन्द्रजालवत् । न युक्तिविरचित तदाभासतया हस्तलाघवादिमायावत् । सर्वेष्वप्येतेषु पक्षेषु असाधारणतया द्रष्टुरौदासीन्ये रसास्वादायोगात् ।[8]

In this large statement, Abhinavagupta accepts none of the Tattva, *Sādṙsya, Bhrānti, Āropa, Adhyavasāya, Utprekṣhā, Tatpratikṛti, Tadanukāra Tātkālika Nirmāṇa* and *Tadābhāsa* as synonyms of Anubhāvana and then declares that Anukīrtana is nothing but *Anuvyavasāya viśeṣa* namely Nātya [9]

Holding fast to his opinions, he questions again, that if *Nāṭya* presents *Anukaraṇa* i.e. imitation, then which aspect of the drama is subjected for to imitation? Is it the character? Is it Vibhāva? Is it Sthayibhāva? There is no other thing in a drama, or in the origin of

sentiments other than the above referred. Of course, there are Anubhāvās. But they are only physical but not sentimental. So mere imitation is impossible in any drama. [10]

Finally, it is decided that in the case of a drama, Anukaraṇa is either *Anuvyavasāya* or *Adhyavasāya* but not mere imitation, and therefore imitation as Bharata says in the verse परचेष्टानुकरणात् हास स्समुपजायते[11] is the basic element of *Hāsa*. In brief, Imitation, as a technical term announced by Abhinavagupta in dramaturgy, is the element of drama i.e. Nāṭya and Imitation in ordinary sense is the element of laughter. In the case of the verse -

शृङ्गारानुकृतिर्या तु स हास्यस्तु प्रकीर्तितः । [12]

Imitation means *Tadābhāsatā* or *Tadanukāratā* which will be dealt with in detail in later chapters. So, the theory of Imitation is the first theory propounded by eastern critics in connection with *Hāsa*. S. C. Sengupta also points out the Imitation theory of Sanskrit critics in his Shakespearean Comedy.[13]

The other reasons of laughter given by Bharata are *Kuhaka, asambaddha. pralāpa, maurkhya, paurobhāgya* etc. Before discussing these elements in detail let us see the other theories of *Hāsa* put forward by the eastern critics.

Almost all the rhetoricians have followed Bharata in dealing with the rhetorics. But there appear some slight differences or amendments or expansions to his theories in pointing out the nature of *Hāsa*.

Hemachandra in *Kāvyānuśāsana*[14] Ramachandra and Guṇachandra in Nāṭyadarpaṇa[15], Śāradātanaya in Bhāvaprakāśana[16], Viśwanātha in Sāhityadarpaṇa[17], Jagannātha in Rasagangādhara[18] are of the opinion that laughter is a glory of the heart. These critics might have aimed at the result of the laughter, which as per the traditional critics is *Vikāsa*, one of the three results of the sentiments in spectators. [19]

This is, in accordance with the theory of the western critic, Thomas Hobbs, who says

"This passion of laughter is nothing else but sudden glory, arising from some sudden conception of some eminency in ourselves, by comparison with the infinity of others, or with our own formerly"-

All the above critics, though they tried to find out the result of the laughter, had not explained that in detail with its reasons and objects. Most of them have given importance to Vikṛti but no explanation is offered.[20]

There is another category of critics like Vidyānatha and Bhanudatta who in their works Pratāparudrīya[21] and Rasatarangiṇi[22] respectively have stated that *Vikāra* is the result of *Hāsa* instead of *Vikāsa*. These critics might have aimed at the disfigured form of the laughable object and have brought the same even into the result of it. So according to these critics, *Vikāra*, a particular change of the heart is the *Hāsa*.

Though, *Vikāsa* and *Vikāra* appear to be synonyms, they show a slight variation. In *vikāsa*, there is no doubt *Vikāra*, but all kinds of *Vikāra* may not be *Vikāsa*. The result of seeing a wonder is also the sudden glory, but there is no comic element in it. So, there is difference between the glory aroused by the wonderful and the glory aroused by laughter. So, the second category of critics is somehow more interested in dealing with laughter with its characteristic feature of Vikāsa than those of the first category.

It is previously said that Bharata has stated *Kuhaka. Asambaddhapralāpa, Paurobhāgya, Maurkhya* etc., too are the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsa*. There is nothing interesting in the definitions of other rhetoricians in connection with the reasons of laughter because all of them have simply stated *Vikṛti* as the main element in the evolution of *Hāsa*, So *Kuhaka*, *Asambaddhapralāpa* or *vikṛtavāk*, *vikṛtaceṣṭā, vikṛtaveṣā, Maurkhya* and *paurobhāgya* are the main features dealt with, as the reasons of laughter.

Bhānudatta, in this connection, gives one more important point. In his definition of *Hāsa*, he added the word "*Kutūhalakṛta*" with all the reasons of the *Hāsa*. Thus, he suggests that the *Vikṛti* of any of the *Vāk*, *Veṣa*, and *Ceṣṭā* should not strikingly be genuine, because it could serve better in creating laughter if it is voluntary. No body would laugh at a physically handicapped person. We simply pity or curse his misfortune, though there is a genuine *Vikṛti* in his movements and actions. If one imitates the movements of such a handicapped person, then, all would laugh at him. So *Vikṛti* should mainly be artificial to serve better the purpose of evoking *Hāsa*. Bhānudatta says that, though there is *Vikṛti* in the dressing and addressing of a person out of fear or anger, it arouses no laughter because of the genuity of the feelings. They are not willingly violated and therefore they do not result in laughter. [23]

Now let us see the reasons of *Hāsa*, as stated by Bharata in detail. According to Abhinavagupta, Kuhaka means the movemental disfiguredness.[24] We act in several ridiculous ways to make children laugh. By our exaggerated or disfigured movements, they laugh in wonder at us. The same is applicable even in the case of some elders who can laugh at meaningless physical movements. But the word *Kuhaka* also means jugglery. The spectators laugh at the acts of a juggler, as he feigns creating things, but in reality, creates nothing. So, the disparity between the juggler's creation and God's appeals to us and makes us laugh. Perhaps Bhānudatta might have recognised the word *Kuhaka* in the sense of juggling and have stated in his definition of *Hāsa* as *Kutūhalakṛta* etc.

Maurkhya and *Paurobhāgya* are certain nature of the human mind. *Maurkhya* means the stubbornness or stupidity. Stubbornness or stupidity does not always result in laughter, because one may be vexed at it at times, one may flare up and become distressed in them. So *Maurkhya* and *Paurobhāgya* are not always the makers of laughter but only at times. For instance, we laugh at a court fool, whose foolishness doesn't hurt any body's feelings, and whose

stupid deeds do not convert the good into bad and the positive result into negative. Hence, we only laugh at a jester whose stubborn but foolish behaviour does not exceed its limits but results in humorous outburst. That is why the adjective *Kutūhalakṛtatva* said by Bhanudatta has its own importance in connection with *Maurkhya* and *Paurobhāgya* also. So, the word *Kuhaka* stated by Bharata in enlisting the elements of *Hāsa* holds good to be prefixed with all the other elements also said by him. In fine we can conclude that, Imitation, Jugglery, the disfigured facial expressions, funny fable, stupidity, censoriousness are the chief factors that provoke laughter. All of these would be adduced in the later chapters.

Classification of Hāsa

All the critics in Sanskrit were interested in classifying *Hāsya* rather than *Hāsa*. Though their classification is mainly based on the varieties of *Hāsa*, they have shown them as the varieties of *Hāsya*. The propriety in doing so will be discussed later while dealing with the classification of *Hāsya*. But *Agnipurāṇa* rightly recognises that the classification of *Hāsya* depends on the classification of *Hāsa* and classifies *Hāsa* as

हासश्चतुविधो लक्ष्य दन्तः स्मित इतीरितः ।
किञ्चित्लक्षित दन्ताग्रं हसितं फुल्ल लोचनम् ॥
विहसितं सस्वनं स्यात् जिह्मोपहसितन्तु तत् ।
सशब्द पापहसितं मशब्द मतिहसितम् ॥ [25]

Thus, according to *Agnipurāṇa, Hāsa* is of four kinds like *Smita, Hasita, Vihasita* and *Apahasita*. This classification of *Hāsa* does not help to understand the varieties of the nature of the origin of *Hāsa* but it clearly shows the variations in the mental state of the spectators influenced by *Hāsa*. Moreover, all these divisions are nothing but the divisions of *Hāsya* propounded by other critics.

One thing is noteworthy here. All the six types of *Hāsya* namely *Smita, Hasita, Vihasita, Upahasita, Apahasita* and *Atihasita* appear in the above verses of *Agnipurāṇa*, but in explaining them *Agnipurāṇa* switched to some sort of confusion. For instance, in the first three lines *Smita, Hasita* and *Vihasita* are explained. So, there is only one to be defined in the fourth line. It reads as- सशब्दं पापहसितं मशब्द मतिहसितम्. Let us take it as Atihasita. Then it should be with and without the sound, as there are two words as *Saśabda* and *aśabda*, which is impossible. Moreover, we have to add that, it is *Pāpahasita*, which is meaningless. Unfortunately, the translators of this part of *Agnipurāṇa* are unaware of this fact. On the other hand, to our surprise Dr. Ramlal Varma, in his Hindi translation says that the fourth type of *Hāsa* is *Apahasita* in which there is *Pāpahasita*[26] Then what about the word *Atihasita* and how the words *Apahasita* and *Pāpahasita* are derived from the only word *Pāpahasita*. Thus, the verses in *Agnipurāṇa* appear a confused lot. We may attribute the same classification of *Hāsya* to the classification of *Hāsa* in *Agnipurāṇa* also as there are all the six divisions of *Hāsya*. But we are made helpless in doing so by the declaration of the author himself as हासश्चतुर्विधः. Let them be either four or six, but they are only the physical movements to express the experience of *Hāsa*. They are purely external.

But, there are some types of *Hāsa* well established colloquially namely *Parihāsa, upahāsa, Apahāsa* etc, the results of which generally differ. Let us see some of them in detail.

Parihāsa is just *Narma* according to eastern critics. *Nāṭaka Lakṣhṇa Ratnakośa* of *Sāgaranandī* defines and illustrates *Narma* as follows-

परिहासवचो नर्म । यथा
वर मशोकतरु र्वकुलो वरो न पुनरस्मि वरस्तव सुभ्रुवः ।
भजति पादतलाहतिरेककको पिबति वक्त्रसुधांश्च तथापरः ॥

The verse is a statement of a hero towards the heroine. It is meant to create fun basing pun. Not only in the aesthetics, but in the day-to-day life also *Parihāsa* plays a major role. One can talk anything one likes, about anything to create fun. We all know the well-established tradition of making others fools on 1st April just for fun. The victims take if sportively and no one considers it serious because it is *Parihāsa*. It helps to enrich the good standards of *Hāsa*. One can take the help of any mood or sentiment to any extent to enchant his listeners. For example, in *Abhijnāna Ṡākuntalā, Duṣyanta* describes *Ṡakuntalā* too much and concludes saying to his companion like this –

क्व वयं क्व परोक्ष मन्मथो मृगशावैस्सम मेधितो जनः ।
परिहासविजल्पितं सरवे परमार्थेन न गृह्यतां वचः ॥ [28]

Here *Duṣyanta* boasts himself and advises his friend not to take the entire eulogy to *Ṡakuntalā* into account as it is just for fun. So *Parihāsa*, which is one of the funny natures of *Hāsa* has no boundary and it may be led to any level within the limitations of decency and delicacy. That is why, Kalidasa has allowed his hero *Dhīrodātta* to talk about *Ṡakuntalā*, a lady in-charge of the hermitage in such a manner and shaped it into fun. Even *Sāmarāja Dīkshita* in *Dhūrtanartaka prahasana* states through the character Mukhara that we may laugh even at our teachers if not crooked and hypocratic.[29]

Parihāsa and *Upahāsa* are actually synonyms even though the word *Parihāsa* is used often.[30] But the word *Apahāsa*[31] has its own nature and meaning. *Apahāsa* may result in untoward consequences at times. It may increase the number of one's opponents. There are many proverbs in many languages supporting it. For in Telugu there are some which read as... A laughter has many meanings.[32] Laughter is dangerous in four ways[33] etc. Many legends and historical events prove the above proverbs. It is said that at the time of the coronation of Srirama, Lakshmana's laughter raised many doubts, even in Srirama Likewise in *Mahābhārata* the laughter of *Bhimasena* at *Suyodhana*

caused and paved the way for the historic battle among brothers. Such illustrations can prove the genuinely of the proverbs. But we have to apply them in the case of *Apahāsa* only, but not to the other types of *Hāsa*.

We have to consider one more thing. In the midst of a laughing people, one should not keep quiet and tight lipped as it may lead to some misunderstandings. The same collection of Telugu proverbs from which the above proverbs are taken has another proverb saying that the person who does not laugh cannot be trusted.[34] So, we have to conclude that one should join in general laughter, but not laugh at any individual which can create awkward situations or untoward consequences

Characteristics of Hāsa

The nature of *Hāsa* is very Peculiar. We laugh at a joke that touches our hearts. We also laugh when we are tickled by someone, even though it does not create any *Vikṛti* in the hearts or minds. So, a comparison between these two is very essential, either to keep them united or separated. The resultant laugh derived by tickling does not show any feeling of the heart. It is just a physical response, a reflective action. But *Hāsa,* our response to a joke is an action of the feeling. Thus, in the response to tickling the sense and the real aim of *Hāsa* are not accomplished.

Moreover, it is too difficult to laugh simultaneously without egoism. Often egoism plays its part and therefore short temperament overcomes the funny situation. Thus, a comedy in a group becomes a tragedy among individuals. To be able to laugh with anyone without any egoism is a boon to mankind. But there are a few persons who, like double-edged knives are capable of laughing and make others laugh. Such gentlemen pay utmost attention to this end, making the best use of the opportunities and moulding them to their advantage, leaving none from being laughed at by them. At the same

time, they should not hurt the feelings of anybody particularly of their selected subject. But all are not blessed with such an opportunity. There are people who cannot laugh whole-heartedly depending on their bent of mind and natural inclination. At times delay in grasping the humour of the situation may be the reason for keeping silent without laughing. Thus, it appears that a talented jester and a receptive audience are a rare phenomenon. That is why persons with such sense of humour were honoured in the courts of well-established kingdoms, but unfortunately, they were called court fools instead of court wits.

A peculiar aspect of life is that all human beings are born crying but not laughing. But it is interesting to note that the infant laughs in sleep even before it completes its second month. It takes some months to the child to laugh while it is awake. Thus, the crying of human beings is spontaneous and comes by birth, but laughing is to be learnt and practised after some time. So, one should try to derive laughter from this, otherwise unhappy world. It is the ability to laugh at things that renders this life worth living. Moreover, in infancy, we laugh at a very simple disorder or a change in the facial expressions of others. But gradually, time ripens the psychological stature of the infant. Thus, the level of that disorder or disfigured should also grow up in order to create laughter in grownup adults.

It is said that man begins his life crying and ends crying.[35] Thus it is essential to build the gap between birth and death with laughter to emblaze the life with victorious aims and to keep it far from despair. So, laughter is one of the predominant elements to lighten our lives and brighten times. The same is said in a wider sense by the Indian Philosophers.

कोह्येवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात् यदेष आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् । [36]

Even the philosophy of Gira mainly asks the human beings not to be affected by any grief.

Hāsa removes all sorts of sorrows at least for some time in every body's life. The life of such people who encourage others to laugh is virtuous. It is a gymnastic feat on a double-edged sword. Such a man has to set aside his afflictions and stimulate others to laugh, in spite of their distresses. That's why court fools in olden days were given such an importance. Being very tactful and wise they pretend like fools at times only to delight the audience.

Hāsa improves the positive side of human character. Generally, those whose faces are glow with a pure pleasant *Hāsa*, cannot be cruel or cunning. Cruelty and hatred turn men into beasts. But *Hāsa* or laughter keeps human. A man who is always sad and mourns constantly cannot be an asset to the society. But a happy man with a cheerful laughter on his lips is always welcome anywhere. Even when he has to face a sad situation, the cheerful man will show a rare sense of humour to laugh at himself also. Thus, *Hāsa* is a unique weapon to wipe out sorrow, grief and misery from human heart. See what Rasuel egamzator says-

Trust me not with truth or humour
Daggers have no sense of humour [37]

Hāsa removes both pain and fear. The heavy burden of a critical and fearful situation, the accompanying nervous tension, and the speedy heart beatings may be relieved with a simple smile. "with the fearful strain" says Abraham Lincoln "that is on me, night and day, if I should not laugh, I should die".[38] Thus, the laughter raising from such a seriousness is priceless and powerful.

An ancient verse quoted by Rudradeva Tripaṭhi in his introduction to *Dhūrtanartaka Prahasana* shows the three important purposes of *Hāsya*.

प्रशमाय च रोगाणां शोकानाञ्च निवृत्तये ।
जठराग्नि विवृद्धयै च हास्यं दिव्यौषधं स्मृतम् ॥

Even the western physicians in their treatises like 'Vitality supreme' have accepted that laughter is also a remedial measure for removing many diseases. 'A sound mind in a sound body' says the proverb. We know that mental and physical healths are twins. It is interesting to note that laughter enhances appetite. The third purpose '*Śokanivāraṇa*' is purely psychological. It is said previously that laughter can remove all physical and psychological grievances. The following verse of the ancient Indian authors supports this view.

गृहेन्धकारेऽभिनव प्रकाशं
करोति हास्यं निरतं मनुष्यः ।
यदीय रम्यैः किरणौः रपास्तं
भवत्यजस्रं भुवि दुःखजालम् ॥

A lover of humour inevitably will be a lover of society too. A humourist, a real humourist will not hate the society. It is a known fact that the human nature differs from person to person. But the man endowed with a sense of humour treats all these variations in people like short temperaments, silly thoughts etc., impartially and with a cool head. He understands even the evil in the society with sympathetic consideration and tries to rectify it, if possible. He never causes any injury to the society. That is why a laugher has more friends than a weeper, let us say. He develops good dealings with the society and influences others as if he is part and parcel of it.

Hāsa is an asset to every individual. It is a part of *Sukha*. It is hardly possible to human beings to be really happy in the vale of tears. Moreover, if we are interested in attaining the *Ānanda*, the supreme of all moods and sentiments, we have to work out a lot. The elements of *Ānanda* are rarely possible in our lives. See the definition of *Ānanda* as said in *Taittirīyopaniṣhad*.

युवा स्यात्साधु युवाध्यायकः । आशिष्ठो द्रढिष्ठो बलिष्ठः । यस्येयं पृथिवी सर्वा वित्तस्य पूर्णा स्यात् । स एको मानुष आनन्दः ।[39]

Such qualitative *Ānanda* is too difficult to attain. Hence, we may at least try to be cheerful and happy with a sense of humour. So, *Hāsa* has its undisturbed importance in the day-to-day life.

There is another mood *Harṣa*, which is closer to *Hāsa*. These two are different. *Harṣa* is defined as

मनोरथस्य लाभेन सिद्ध्या योग्यस्य वस्तुनः ।
मित्रसङ्गम देवादि प्रसादादेश्च कल्पितः ॥
मनः प्रसादो हर्षस्स्यादत्र नेत्रास्यफुल्लता ।
प्रियभाषणमाश्लेषः पुलकानां प्ररोहणम् ॥
स्वेदोद्गमश्च हस्तेन हस्तसम्पीडनादयः ॥ [40]

Let me give an illustration for Harsa from Śisupālavadham

युगान्तकाल प्रतिसंहृतात्मनो जगन्ति यस्यां सविकासमासत
तनौ ममुस्तत्र न कैटभद्विष स्तपोधनाभ्यागम सम्भवा मुदः ॥ [41]

In this verse, the feeling of Harṣa of Krishna after seeing Narada is described. Thus, *Harṣa* is the purity of mind with the fulfilment of desire, which results in the happiness, of feeling pleasant talking and brightening of the eyes. The above verse may also be an illustration of the definition of *Hāsa* as said by Śāradātanaya which is already dealt with in detail (प्रीतेविशेषः चित्तस्य विकासो हास उच्यते). But it is already said that *Vikṛti* is very essential in the case of *Hāsa* rather than *Vikāsa*. Then, this illustration does not cover the definition of *Hāsa*. In spite of the fundamental difference between *Harṣa* and *Hāsa*, the former is very closer to *Hāsa* and a constant supporter of it, with all its phenomenon and feelings. Moreover, *Hāsa* is a permanent mood and *Harsa* is temporary.

Recognising the importance of the *Hāsa*, Sanskrit writers have tried to enrich it with many types of comic writings. There are *Prahelikās*, the poetry of *Anyāpadeśa* (pretensive poetry), and various types of *Ċitra* poetry. Taking the support of each and every

subject in Sanskrit many scholars with a sense of humour have nourished the comic.

A HUMOUROUS TRIO IN PUPPET PLAYS

Puppet plays in India are very ancient and were very famous and amusing until the origin and development of moving films. That too "Tolubommalāta" (skinny puppets) rather than Koyya bommalāta" (wooden Puppets) was well developed in South India. In these puppet plays a humourous trio namely "Ketigādu" or "Kille Gittarigādu", "Gandoligādu or "Gandharigādu' and 'Bangārakka.' These three are as similar as *Sūtradhāra*, *Pāripārsvika* and Nati in the prelude of Sanskrit Dramas. But these three in Puppet plays, enter the stage often to relieve the spectators of their boredom or tension. Asa matter of fact these three alone hold much responsibility in the success of a puppet play. Though, their dialogues and action seem extremely vulgar, crowds of countrymen gather anxiously to enjoy them. It is not exaggerating to say that most of the spectators attend a puppet play only to enjoy the trio of humourous characters.

JUGGLERY

This is a type of magic. It has much historical background but now it is just underground. In olden days country magicians were playing their tricks in the courts of the kings. Śriharṣa while describing the fame of the king says as –

भुवि भ्रमित्वाऽनवलम्बमम्बरे विहर्तु मभ्यासपरम्परा परा ।
अहो महावंशममुं समाश्रिता सकौतुकं नृत्यति कीर्तिनर्तकी ॥

This is called "Indrajāla" also But now such jugglers are seldom seen on roadside platforms, showing their magic to little crowds around them. Most of them had accepted jugglery as a means of livelihood, and attracting the crowds had occupied major part of their play rather than showing their ability and skill. In Indrajāla

Prahasana which will be dealt with later on, we can see such a juggler. Some other Sanskrit classics are there like *Bhānās*, where in the appreciation of Jugglery is seen.

VIPRAVINODA

This is also a type of magic, but we never see the presentation of this amidst a crowd is never seen. Vipravinodins (country magicians) are very rare and appear only in villages and mini towns. They come door to door once in a year and entertain the familiar gatherings. Rewarding them is taken as an annual subscription and therefore nobody hesitates to please them.

Vipravinodin creates coins from empty hands and frogs out of a piece of stone. Taking a book of palm leaves they perform many types of magic such as once showing one picture on a leaf, changing that immediately to another and within no time making the palm blank. Unfortunately, now Vipravinoda is breathing its last.

FANCY DRESSES

Occasionally fancy dresses come out for the merriment of gatherings. On some particular festival days like 'Dasarā' 'Samkrānti' etc., some people especially people from low classes makeup themselves as the incarnations of Śrirāma, ŚriKṛiṣṇa, Ānjaneya etc., and go along the streets. Fancy dresses appear on the anniversary functions of educational institutions. Unfortunately, roadside display of fancy dressing is given no importance by the middle or the high-class people. So, it is treated as the cheapest type of livelihood. Besides these displays of fancy dressing there are other features such as playing dual roles, delivering pathetic but humorous dialogues, imitating the well-known in a funny manner, and so on.

Though, all these people appear as beggars and though we offer something to them, first of all we have to thank them for their dedicated life to make others happy with their art.

It is very common in our country that sisters-in-law, and brothers-in-law are mocked at and made fun of during weddings. We have not only realized the importance of *Hāsa* in this unhappy world, but also given a significant place in routine life.

Critics have considered the supremacy of *Hāsa* and have enlisted it among permanent moods i.e, *sthāyins*, and brought it up into literature by the name, *Hāsya* as one of the (nine) sentiments. Even Bharata has enlisted *Hāsa* and *Hāsya* in the list of *Sthāyins* and Rasas as

रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥ [43]

शृङ्गार हास्य करुण रौद्रवीर भयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतसंज्ञौ चेत्यष्टौ नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः ॥ [44]

FOOT NOTES

1) Bhāvaprakāśana 3-36, 37
2) Naatya Sastra 7-10
3) Ibid 6-40
4) Ibid 1 112
5) Ibid 1-117
6) Abhinavabhāratī vol I p p 274, 275
7) Nāṭya sāstra 1-107
8) Abhinavabhārati vol I P 35
9) इदानीमुपाय संवेदना लाभात् तदिदमनुकीर्तन मनुव्यवसाय विशेषो नाट्यापर पर्यायः P 36
तेन अनुव्यवसायवत् विशेष विषयीकरणं नाट्यम् P 37
तस्मादनुव्यवसायात्मकं कीर्तनं रुषितत्विकल्प संवेदनं नाट्यम्। तद्वेदनवेद्यत्वात्। नत्वनुकरण रूपम्। यदित्वेवं मुख्य लौकिक करणानुसारितया अनुकरण मित्युच्यते। तन्न कश्चित् दोषः P 37
10) अनुकारइति सदृशकरणम्। तत्कस्य? न तावद्रामादेः। तस्य अननुकार्यत्वात्। एतेन प्रमदादिविभावाना मनुकरणम् पराकृतम्। न चित्तवृत्तीनां शोक क्रोधादि रूपाणाम्। नहि नटो रामसदृशं स्वात्मनः शोकं करोति। सर्वथैव तस्य तत्र अभावात्। भावे वा अननुकारत्वात्। न चान्यद्वस्त्वस्ति यच्छोकेन सदृशं स्यात्। अनुभावांस्तु करोति। किन्तु सजातीयत्वेन। न तु तत्सदृशान् P 37
11) Nāṭya sāstra 7-13
12) Ibid 6-40
13) Sanskrit writers of aesthetics told that the comic Rasa is aroused by the imitation of other Rasas
- Shakespearean comedy. P10
14) चेतसो विकासो हासः P 126
15) रञ्जनोन्मादानुविद्धः चित्तस्य विकासो हासः 3-126
16) प्रीति विशेषस्चित्तस्य विकासो हास उच्यते 2-75
17) वागङ्गादि विकृतैः चेतसो विशेषो हासः 3-176
18) वागङ्गादि विकार दर्शन जन्मा विकासाख्यो हासः P 45
19) गुणानां चैतेषां द्रुति दीप्ति विकासाख्या स्तिस्रः चित्तवृत्तयः क्रमेण प्रयोज्याः। तत्तद्गुण विशिष्ट रस चर्वणा इति यावत्। Rasagangādhara P 221
20) The works of Thomas Hobbs Vol IV P 46

21) विकृति दर्शनादि जन्यो मनोविकारो हासः P 152
22) कुतूहल कृत वचन वेष वैसादृश्य कृतो विनोदपूर्णः मनोविकारो हासः P 14
23) वचनभेद वेषभेदकृते भयक्रोधे नातिव्याप्तिः । तत्र कुतूहल कृतत्वाभावात् Rasatarangiṇi P 16
24) कक्षग्रीवादि दर्शनम् विस्मापनविधिप्रसिद्धं बालानाम् Abhinavabhārati vol I 133
25) Agnipurāṇa 6-9, to 11
26) जहाँ मुख भी खुल जाये और शब्द भी हो उसे अपहसित कहते हैं। उस अपहसित हास्य में पाप सी रहती है। अर्थात् - इस मे हास्य का विकृत रूप रहता है । अप्नि पुराण का काव्यशास्त्रीय भाग P 56, 57
27) Nāṭakalakṣaṇa ratnakośa P 132
28) Abhijnāna Śākuntala Act II v 18
29) गुरुणापि समं हास्यं कर्तव्यं कुटिलं विना
30) उपहासः ... परिहासे Śabdārthakalpataru P251
31) उपहासः अकारण हास्ये Ibid P 121
32) Navvuku Nānārthālu - Telugu Sāmetalu P 245
33) Navvu Nālugandāla Naṣṭam -Ibid-
34) Navvaleni vārini Nammarādu -Ibid-
35) Life he enjoyed but for the bright span
Address and occupation are unknown
All that we know is that he was a man
Who being born did cry and dying moan
Selected Poems P 181
36) Taittīrīyopaniṣad Ānandavalli
37) Selected Poems P-191
38) New Dictionary of thoughts P-265
39) Taittīrīyopaniṣad Ānandavalli
40) Rasārṇava sudhākara 2-76 to 78
41) Śiśupālavadha 1-13
42) Naishadha kāvya 12-16
43) Nāṭya Sāstra 6-17
44) -Ibid- 6-15

HĀSYA

The word *Hāsya* has been derived from the root *Hasa*, which means *Hasana*, to laugh. Bharata explains it as *Hāsya*

विपरीतालङ्कारैः विकृताचाराभिधानवेषै श्च ।
विकृतै रर्थविशषै र्हसतीति रसः स्मृतो हास्यः ॥

विकृताचार वाक्यै रङ्गविकारै श्च विकृतवेषै श्च ।
हासयति जनं यस्मात्तस्माद् ज्ञेयो रसो हास्यः ॥ [1]

There are two interpretations of the word *Hāsya*. In the first, the person whose movements and behaviour result in *Hāsya* is the subject of *Hāsya* and in the second, the affirmation or the deed that the subject does, is *Hāsya*.

In addition to this, Bharata defined *Hāsya* as-

शृङ्गाराद्धि भवेद्धास्यः रौद्राच्च करुणो रसः ।
वीरा च्चैवाद्भुतोत्पत्ति र्बीभत्साच्च भयानकः ॥ [2]

and

शृङ्गाराकृति र्या तु स हास्यस्तु प्रकीर्तितः ॥ [3]

Bharata is of the opinion that *Hāsya* is derived from *Sṛngāra* and it imitates *Sṛngāra*. Is it possible to reproduce *Hāsya* from *Sṛngāra*? If possible, how? These are the two questions before us to make inquiry. For that we have to refer to *Abhinavabhārati* in which Abhinavagupta says as --

तदाभासत्वेन तदाकारतया हेतुत्वं शृङ्गारेण सूचितम् ॥ [4]

It means that *Hāsya* is not originated directly from *Sṛngāra* itself, but it is either from *Sṛngārābhāsa* or *Sṛngārānukaraṇa*. And also Abhinavagupta while commenting on the verse रसभावतदाभास भावशान्त्यादिरक्रमः । ध्वनेरात्माङ्गि भावेन भासमानो व्यवस्थितः in *Dhvanyāloka*, means the word *Anukṛti* as *Ābhāsa* by saying

अनुकृति रमुख्यता आभास इति ह्येकोऽर्थः ॥ [5]

Thus, the resemblance of *Sṛngāra*, the unimportant stature of *Sṛngāra* and the imitation of *Sṛngāra* are synonyms. Then, where is the need for Bharata to say as *Sṛngārānukrti* instead of *Sṛngārābhāsa.*

Abhinavagupta answers this question also in the same context in *Loçana* as

(यद्यपि 'शृङ्गारानुकृति र्यात्य् स हास्यः' इते मुनिना निरूपितं तथाप्यौत्तर कालितं तत्र हास्यरसत्वम्। 'दूराकर्षण मोहमंत्र इव मे तन्नाम्नि याते श्रुतिं, चेतः कालकलामपि प्रसहते नावस्थिति तां विना' इत्यत्र तु न हास्य चर्वणावकाशः। ननु नात्र रतिस्थायि भावोऽस्ति। परस्परास्थाबन्धाभावात्। केनै तदुक्तं रतिरिति। रत्याभासो हि सः। अतश्चभासता येनास्य सीता मयि उपेक्षिका द्विष्टा वेति प्रतिपत्तिः हृदयं न स्पृशत्येव। तत्स्पर्शे हि तस्याप्यभिलाषो विलीयते। न च मयीय मनुरक्तेति अपि निश्चयेन कृतं, कामकृतान्मोहात्। अत एव तदाभासत्वं वस्तुतस्तत्र स्थाप्यते शुक्तौ रजताभासवत्। एतच्च शृङ्गारानुकृतिशब्दं प्रयुञ्जानो मुनिरपि सूचितवान्)

In the above verse i.e., दूराकर्षण etc. there is actually no *Sṛngāra* because there is no *Rati*, the *Sthāyin* of *Sṛngāra*. But there is only *Ratyābhāsa*. So, the sense *Sṛngārābhāsa* is mistaken as *Sṛngāra*, like shell being mistaken as silver. That is why Bharata has been forced to say as *Sṛngāranukṛti* instead of *Sṛngārābhāsa*. Thus, the sentiment *Sṛngāra*, not perfectly Sṛngāra but the imitation of *Sṛngāra*, where it results in the resemblance of *Sṛngāra* is the basic element of *Hāsya*. Though Bharata limited the resemblance of *Sṛngāra* only, as the basic element of *Hāsya*, Abhinavagupta extended it to the resemblance of all other sentiments.

एवं यो यस्य न बन्धुः तच्छोके करुणोरुणोपि हास्य एवेति सर्वत्र योज्यम्[6]

Let us study this as a full-fledged point, but not before studying the technical definition of *Hāsya* according to critics.

विभावानुभाव व्यभिचारिसंयोगा द्रस निष्पत्तिः is the fundamental definition of all sentiments given by Bharata, and being followed by later critics. So *Hāsya* should also have certain *Vibhāvās*, *Anubhāvās* and *Vyabhiçāribhāvās* for its origin.

VIBHĀVA[7]:- It is the canvas on which the picture of *Ras*a could have a phenomenon. All the critics in general have dealt with the *Vibhāva*, without any peculiarity or difference. But Śāradātanaya in *Bhāvaprakāśana* calls the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya* as *Lalitābhāsa*[8] and explains the term *Lalitābhāsa* like this-

संसूचिता श्रुता दृष्टा स्मृता ये हासकारिणः ।
ते भावा ललिताभासा हास्यसम्पत्प्रकाशकाः ॥ [9]

Though the term *Lalitābhāsa* is apt and useful, the explanation offered by Śāradātanaya is hardly helpful to *Hāsya* in connection with *Vibhāvās*. Bharata lists out the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya* as follows--

सच विकृतपरवेषालङ्कार धार्ष्ट्य लौल्य कुहकासत्प्रलाप व्यङ्गदर्शन - दोषोदाहरणादिभि र्विभावै रुपपद्यते । [10]

In this statement there are seven *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya* namely -

विपरीतवेषालङ्कार-धार्ष्ट्य-लौल्य-कुहक-असत्प्रलाप-व्यङ्गदर्शन and दोषोदाहरण. विकृतपरवेषालङ्कर is to be specified under *Āhāryābhinaya*, one of the four types of action. It is the easiest process to provoke *Hāsya* because of its physical phenomenon ready to be caught. Later critics have developed and explained the *Vibhāva* विकृतपरवेषालङ्कार. Hemachandra estimates it as--

देशकाल वयो वर्ग वैपरीत्यात् विकृताः केशबन्धादयो वेषाः आदिशब्दात् नर्तनान्यगत्याद्यनुकरणा-सत्प्रलाप भूषणादीनि । [11]

and also Bhānudatta in *Rasataraṅgiṇi* as

विपरीतालङ्कारैर्विकृताचाराभिधानवेषैश्च ।
विकृतै रर्थविशेषै र्हसतीति रसः स्मृतो हास्यः ॥ [12]

Hemachandra has rightly pointed out both the *Vikṛti* and *Vaiparītya* and Bhānudatta has given a wide description of *Vikṛti*. So *Vikṛti* and *Vaiparītya* of things enlisted in the above two statements are the *Vi*bhāvās of *Hāsya*. In brief, *Vikṛti* of *Vaiparītya* of any of the four types of action is the *Vibhāva* of *Hāsya*.

The queer nature of *Āhārya*, i.e., make up or embellishment mainly depends upon particular time, place, environment, season etc. A dress suitable in winter is not suitable in summer. If one wears so, the strangeness of it prompts the others to laugh at it. Similarly, the combination of eastern and western dressing creates merriment. If one is in favour of evolving *Hāsya* deliberately, one may dress like that.

The spectators should also judge the oddity of embellishment. A dull banality that falls flat before the aged may draw ripples of laughter from the children. Likewise, the peculiarity is judged even by the psychological conditions of persons. Replacement of certain important and specific adornments at the time of decoration also results in *Hāsya*. See a statement of Bharata-

अदेशयुक्तो वेषो हि न शोभां जनयिष्यति ।
मेखलोरसि बद्धा तु हास्यं समुपपादयेत् ॥ [13]

A procession on a donkey is a matter of insult for eastern people, whereas for English people it is a matter of prestige. *Vikṛti* or *Vaiparītya* of makeup depending on many subordinates provokes comic quicker than the *Vikṛti* of dialogues and movements. So, it has such importance in the nourishment of comic.

Vikṛti or *Vaiparītya* of आङ्गिकाभिनय is the imitation of physical movements and deeds. Imitation of the gait of a lame man results in *Hāsa*. The oddity in the movement of people and unnecessary suspense too sometimes cause *Hāsya*.

Vikṛti and *Vaiparītya* of dialogues are of many kinds and play a major role in the entire comic universe. This will be dealt with later in detail.

The remaining six *Vibhāvās* said by Bharata are *dhārṣṭya* which means *Nirlajjatā* i.e., to behave without shyness, which Abhinavagupta explains as विषयेषु अनियतता i.e., irregular and unstable behaviour. *Kuhaka* which according to Abhinavagupta means to touch the armpits, ribs etc., which helps as a *Vibhāva*, particularly in the contamination of *Hāsya*. *Asatpralāpa* means nonsense, abuse, rude statements, etc. *Vyangadarsana* means pretending anything and *Doshodāharana* i.e., to pretend the feeling of something, which actually he does not feel.

Pedakomaṭi VEmā Reddy in his *Sāhityaçintāmaṇi* explains the *Vibhāvās* in a wider range, like this -

दुल्लौल्यविकृताकार निर्लज्जत्वादि तद्गुणैः ।
स्वराणां मृगपक्ष्यादेः मनुष्याणां गिरामपि ॥

वेदशास्त्र कलाविद्या देशभाषादिकस्य च ।
विडम्बनैरसम्बद्धासत्प्रलापैश्च वाचिकैः ॥

परक्रियानुकरण गंन्धर्वाद्यवचेष्टितैः ।
व्यत्यस्तविकृताश्लील वेषैरपि विभूषणैः ॥ [14]

We have to thank Pedakomaṭi VEmā Reddy for his clear and extensive explanation of the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya*.

Śāradātanaya following his predecessors, tactfully explained the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya* as-

विकटाकारवेषेण विकृताचार कर्मभिः ।
विकृतैरपि वाक्यैश्च धाष्ट्य लौल्यानुभूतिभिः ॥
विकृताभिनयेनैव विकृताङ्गावलोकनात् ।
कुहकासत्प्रलापेन दोषोदाहरणादिभिः ॥
हास्यः स्यात् [15]

Here Śāradātanaya has carefully used the adjective *Vikṛti* with most of his *Vibhāvās*. Barring this he followed the footsteps of Bharata completely.

But Abhinavagupta, the authority on eastern rhetorics is very simple in dealing with the *Vibhāva* of *Hāsya*, for he अनौचित्य प्रवृत्ति कृतमेव हि हास्यविभावत्वम् [16] in Abhinavabhārati while commenting on the verse शृङ्गारानुकृतिः etc., of Bharata. But for our consideration the statement of Abhinavagupta does not suffice because there are many funny and intellectual appeals as the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya*, which do not come under Anouṣitya. Many types of figurative humour, substantive humour etc., are very pure and promising in evolving *Hāsya* but they should not be categorised under *Anouṣitya*. I think that Abhinavagupta might have stated so only in connection with the statement of Bharata, but not in the complete form and sense of *Vibhāva*, he supposes.

There is another important point regarding the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya*. Abhinavagupta has mentioned seven obstacles of aesthetic experience which restrict the spectators from realizing the sentiment conveyed. They are

प्रवृत्तावयोग्यता सम्भावनाविरहो नाम स्वगतत्व परगतत्व नियमेन देशकाल वयो विशेषावेशो निज सुखादिविवशीभावः प्रतीत्युपायवैकल्यं स्फुटत्वाभावोऽप्रधानता संशययोगश्च । [17]

These, mainly restrict the spectators from getting the *Vibhāva* etc., elements, generalised, by which they can come out of the sphere of गम्यागम्यविवेक at the time of aesthetic experience. If any of these obstacles works in a spectator, no sentiment will be experienced except *Hāsya*. In *Hāsya*, even if the obstacles play their part one may experience the *Hāsya* because अगम्यात्वभाव of *Vibhāva* is not very essential in the experience of *Hāsya*. As said previously we may laugh at anybody without any crookedness or hypocrisy, at everything or even at ourselves. So, naturally, *Hāsya* tries to overcome the presence of the seven obstacles which hold good in the case of other sentiments. Moreover, *Hāsya* helps a man to get rid of the said obstacles step by step, if he is offered a chance.

ANUBHAAVAS [18]:

Rasārṇava sudhākara classifies *Anubhāva* into four kinds by saying

भावं मनोगतं साक्षात् सहेतु व्यञ्जयन्ति ये।
तेऽनुभावा इति ख्याता भ्रू विक्षेपस्मितादयः ॥
ते चतुर्धा चित्तगात्र वाक्बुद्ध्यारम्भसम्भवाः ॥ [19]

But all these are not fully helpful to develop *Hāsya*. As a matter of fact, they are connected with *Śṛngāra* and so are hardly helpful to comic, though they are many in number with their sub-divisions. Moreover, the above four are useful if the sentiment has to run smoothly. But the sentiment, *Hāsya* in general is out of order. This may be the very reason for the uselessness of the above four in *Hāsya*.

Bharata has enumerated a good number of *Anubhāvās* in connection with *Hāsya*. Read the following-

तस्योष्ठनासा कपोल स्पन्दन दृष्टिव्याकोशाकुञ्चन स्वेदास्यराग पार्श्वग्रहणादिभि रनुभावैरभिनयः प्रयोक्तव्यः ॥ [20]

Quivering of lips, nose and cheeks; movements of breathing, perspiration, reddish face, holding on ribs etc., are the *Anubhāvās* of *Hāsya*.

Basically, *Anubhāvās* are of two kinds namely *Sāttvikabhāva* and *Anubhāva*. *Anubhāvās* are the movements of the actor, who represents the character, but *Sāttvikabhāvas* are the movements of the spectators on one hand, and movements of the actors on the other. So, many of the above list given by Bharata are the movements of spectators rather than of the actors. As *Hāsya* itself is based on many disfigured movements taking as its *Vibhāvās*, additional list of actions is not essential. A special study in connection with the *Anubhāvās* of *Hāsya* will be taken while dealing with the classification of *Hāsya*.

We find the following verse of Bharata, in the twenty. sixth chapter of *Nātyasāstra*.

प्रत्यङ्गहीनं यत्काव्यं विकृतञ्च प्रयुज्यते ।
न लक्षणकृतस्तत्र कार्यस्त्वभिनयो बुधैः ॥ [21]

This statement of Bharata declares that an actor is cent per cent independent while enacting a comic playlet. He can gesticulate as he wishes to draw laughter from the audience. As said previously the thing out of order is the main element of *Hāsya*. So, there is no necessity of notifying the process of the four types of actions in connection with *Hāsya*. In one word, in the evolution of *Hāsya* irregularity co-operates better than regularity, liberty than restrictions and disorder than order.

The impropriety of displaying the dressing and misplacing the ornaments is beyond the limits and therefore one cannot particularly point out that. Moreover, it is not at all beneficial in the case of Hāsya. Recognising this very fact Bharata has taken an advanced but proper step in exempting *Hāsya* from the common rules of dramaturgy at the time of representation.

VYABHIÇĀRI BHĀVAS:[22]

व्यभिचारिण श्चास्य आलस्यावहित्थतन्द्र निद्रास्वप्न प्रबोधासूयादयः is the list of *Vyabhiçāribhāvās* of *Hāsya* given by Bharata. All these are supposed to be applied with their original form to *Hāsya*. If there is a little disorder, all the thirty-three *Bhāvās* are capable to evolve

Hāsya. Moreover, all the remaining eight permanent moods (i.e., *sthāyins*) are also capable to be *Vyabhiçāribhāvās* of *Hāsya*.

Now let us deal with the resemblance of *Sṛngāra* or the resemblance of any other sentiment, in which, it is stated that *Hāsya* has its roots.

Generally, all sentiments are supposed to be entertained through *Vibhāvās* corresponding with them. *Hāsya* is also one of them. All the *Vibhāvās* of *Hāsya*, has said previously lead a reader or spectator to reach the premises of *Hāsya*. But we have to note that the above *Vibhāvās* can make one realise only *Hāsya*. There is no touch of any other mood or sentiment. *Hāsy*a has a peculiar state among the sentiments i.e., it does not require direct *Vibhāva* invariably for its existence unlike other sentiments. Even without knowing proper reason for some body's laughter, we can laugh at something with somebody. That is why *Hāsya* is said to be contagious.

The second way of creating *Hāsya* is the falsehood of any other sentiment or mood *Hāsya* could also be enjoyed through a mood or sentiment being its *Vibhāva* instead of pure *Vibhāva*. We know the statement of Abhinavagupta that every false sentiment, results in *Hāsya* only.[23] Let us call this *Ābhāsahāsya*. But when the *Hāsya* itself becomes false, it is *Hāsyābhāsa*. Then what results in *Hāsyābhāsa*? Whether the theory of Abhinavagupta is applicable or not, is the present question. So let us define and illustrate the three terms *Hāsya*, *Ābhāsahāsya* and *Hāsyābhāsa* and distinguish them from each other.

Enjoyment of the sentiment through mere gesticulation happens in *Hāsya*. Though the other sentiments also consist of gesticulations, experience of the sentiment by mere gesticulations is possible only in *Hāsya*. So, where there is mere description of a gesticulation without its corresponding *Vibhāva* of the sentiment there appears *Hāsa*. For instance, movements like taunting and attacking are suitable in a battlefield when the enemy is ahead. If such gesticulations are displayed without any enemy before they give room to *Hāsya*. So, the gesticulations, not in accordance with the corresponding

sentiment, cause *Hāsya*. One thing is to be clarified here. Movements of limbs are common in every human being. Without any notice certain moments accompany our moods, thoughts and enjoyments. Such movements differ from person to person. They are genuine and do not give any scope for the realisation of *Hāsya*. But, some other movements, which correspond to certain sentiments provoke *Hāsya*, if they are displayed without harmony.

The three types of the elements of Hāsya, are disfigured, impropriety and indecency. Disfigured produces pure Hāsya, impropriety causes the *Ābhāsahāsya* and indecency provokes the *Hāsyābhāsa* or aversion.

Disfigured, impropriety and indecency are not Synonyms. There is slight but clear difference among these three. Impropriety and indecency may also be disfigured. But every disfigured state need not be improper or indecent. Wit is a form of disfigured in which there is neither impropriety nor indecency. Impropriety is a part of disfigured but disfigured alone is not impropriety.

If we observe impropriety and indecency keenly, they appear different. All that is indecent need not be improper and vice-versa. An improper thought or sentiment may be represented in a polished and civilized manner. So, impropriety is a stage that decides the eligibility or lack of eligibility of certain things to be subjected to. Indecency is the stage which brings out the thought into action. Impropriety plays its part in the acceptance of the *Vibhāva* and indecency in the representation of the accepted *Vibhāva*. So, as a whole, disfigured, impropriety and indecency respectively result in *Hāsya, Ābhāsahāsya* and *Hāsyābhāsa*. Sometime *Ābhāsahāsya* may change and appear as *Hāsya*, depending on the taste of the audience.

Hāsya takes place through *Vikṛti* in Satires etc. It is also seen in Farce but impropriety dominates Farce. Indecency is seen clearly in vulgar Farce. Let me explain these three in detail with examples. See a conversation between Viśvabhānda and Vyādhisindhu in Hāsyārṇava prahasana. [24]

विश्व :- अयि व्याधिसिन्धो । अपि कुशलं तव पितुरातुरान्तकस्य अन्तकालयप्राप्तस्य?

व्याधि :- कुतः कुशलं भवद्दर्शनं विना ।

It is a fantastic repartee, brought up by *Vikṛti* in feelings. Here we cannot find any impropriety or indecency. So, it comes under pure *Hāsya*. Read another illustration.

वैद्य - शृणोतु भवती

वातिका पैत्तिकाश्चैव श्लै श्लै... अपिहा पुस्तकं पुस्तकम्

शाण्डिल्य:- अहो वैद्यस्याभिरूपता । एकपदे विस्मृतः । भवतु मम वयस्य एव । इदं पुस्तकम् ।

This is a bit from Bhagavadajjuka Prahasana.[25] It reveals the pure heart of *Śāṅdilya* who allows self-review of his nature, and at the same time it is witty and we should laugh at him. But impropriety or indecency do not come up here. That is why it is called pure *Hāsya*.

ĀBHĀSAHĀSYA:

Hāsya aroused of impropriety may also be mixed with other sentiments. *Rasābhāsa* or *Rasabhanga*, being incapable to be entertained with the corresponding sentiment, accept the form of impropriety and result in *Hāsya*. This impropriety is said to be an imitation by Bharata in definitions of *Hāsya*.

But *Rasābhāsa* has not been defined or denoted by Bharata. The first critic to point out *Rasābhāsa* is Udbhata. He connected it with a figure of speech.[26] But Rudrata has defined *Śṛngārābhāsa* as follows-

शृङ्गाराभासस्स तु यत्र विरक्तेऽपि जायते रक्तः ।
एकस्मिन्नपरोसौ नाभाप्येषु प्रयोक्तव्यः ॥ [27]

Rudrata has kept aside *Rasābhāsa* from the gentlemen as it is improper.

Ānandavardhana describes the impropriety as the roof cause of *Rasabhanga*.

अनौचित्यादृते नान्यद्रसभङ्गस्य कारणम् । [28]

Rasabhanga or *Rasābhāsa* are more or less synonyms in the case of *Hāsya*.

This impropriety is not constant. It varies from place to place and from time to time. It is to be discussed and decided as per the contemporary social conditions only. That is why Jagannātha says -

विभावादावनौचित्यम् पुनः लोकव्यवहरति विज्ञेयम्। यत्र तेषा मनुचितमिति धीः इति केचित्। [29]

Kṣemendra also has been of the same opinion, who exposes as-

उचितं प्नाहुराचार्याः सदृशं किल यस्य यत्।
उचितस्य च यो भावः तदौचित्यं प्रचक्षते ॥ [30]

Critics on *Rasābhāsa* say that *Rasābhāsa* happens at the out let of *Rasa*, at its development, and even at the stage of its enjoyment. Singabhūpāla defines *Rasābhāsa* in a particular way in Rasārṇava sudhākara as -

अङ्गेनाङ्गी रसः स्वेच्छावृत्ति वर्धितसम्पदा।
अमात्ये नाविनीतेन स्वामीवाभसतां व्रजेत् ॥ [31]

Where the subordinate sentiment dominates the main, it becomes *Rasābhāsa* and where non-aligned *Rasās* are blended together, there is every possibility for *Rasābhāsa*. See how Ṡāradātanaya has explained the various combinations of the sentiments which lead to *Rasābhāsa*.

हास्याभिभूतः शृङ्गारस्तदाभासो भविष्यति।
हास्यो बीभत्समिलितो हास्याभास उदाहृतः ॥

वीरो भयानकाविष्टो वीराभास इतीरितः।
बीभत्सकरुणाश्लेषादद्भुताभास उच्यते ॥

रौद्रः शोकभयाविष्टो रौद्राभास इतीरितः।
हास्यशृङ्गारखचितः करुणाभास उच्यते ॥

वीभत्साद्भतशृङ्गारी बीभत्साभास उच्यते।
रौद्रवीरानुषक्तश्चे दाभासः स्याद्भयानके ॥32

Rhetoricians differ in many aspects regarding *Rasābhāsa*. First of all, we have to decide whether *Rasābhāsa* always results in comic or not. Some of the modern cities are of the opinion that *Rasābhāsa*

does never completely evoke *Hāsya*. The episodes of Draupadi and Kiçaka in Mahābhārata and Varūthini and Pravara in MārkanḍEyapurāṇa are the best examples of *Rasābhāsa*. They have not been completely given the shape of *Hāsya*. Moreover, some of the critics opine that the spectators while witnessing such incidents are experiencing *Sṛngāra* itself. So, the actual position of the experience of *Rasābhāsa* is to be decided.32

Vidyādhara, the author of Ekāvali has criticised the definition of *Rasābhāsa* given by Rudraṭa which reads as-

एकत्रैवानुरागश्चेत् त्तिर्यङ्म्लेच्छगतोऽपि वा ।
योषितो बहुरक्ति श्चेद्रसाभासस्त्रिधा मतः ॥ [33]

and decided that *Sṛngāra* of animals and *MlEççha* should not be *Sṛngārābhāsa*. But Singabhūpāla in Rasārṇavasudhākara did not admit the theory of Vidyādhara and condemned it out right. [34]

But we could not conclude that *Rasābhāsa* is contrary to *Rasa*. Even in *Rasābhāsa* the corresponding *Rasa* can be enjoyed; unlike *HEtvābhāsa*, *Virodhābhāsa* etc., *Rasābhāsa* does not stand as an obstacle to *Rasa*. In *Rasābhāsa* impropriety prevails as an after effect. Jagannatha also might have allowed the experience of *Rasa* in *Rasābhāsa* and *Bhāva* in *Bhāvābhāsa* as he explains the mood of an elephant, taking it as an illustration of *Moha.*

Read -

शुण्डा दण्डं कुण्डलीकृत्य कूले
कल्लोलिन्या किञ्चिदाकुञ्चिताक्षः ।
नैवाकर्षत्यम्बु नैवाम्बुजालिं
कान्तापेतः कृत्यशून्यो गजेन्द्रः ॥ [35]

One thing must be made clear. Impropriety, has two stages. namely *Anuçitatva*, i.e., improper and *Anarhatva* i.e. ineligible. All the *Vibhāvās* that are improper need not be ineligible. On the other hand, impropriety may appear sometimes even in eligible *Vibhāvās*. One's wife is an *Ālambana vibhāva* to oneself. But in the conversation if one says as-

चुम्बनं देहि मे भार्ये कामचण्डालतृप्तये ।

It Is on the verge of rudeness and becomes improper, but it is eligible. So, *Ābhasatā* depends upon the ineligibility and impropriety of the *Vibhāva*. But impropriety overcomes ineligibility. So, where there is only ineligibility but not impropriety one may experience the corresponding sentiment. Of course, there is an after effect of *Hāsya*. But where there is impropriety, though it is eligible, it results in *Hāsya*. If both ineligibility and impropriety appear, no doubt, there is the experience of *Hāsya* only. Here are three examples for the ineligible *Sṛngāra* i.e. *Hāsya* with after effect only, the eligible but improper *Sṛngāra* i.e., *Hāsya*, and the ineligible and improper *Sṛngāra.*

दूराकर्षण मोह मन्त्र इव में तन्नाम्नि याते श्रुतिं
चेतः काल कलामपि प्रसहते नावस्थितिं तां विना ।
एतैराकुलितस्य विक्षतरते रङ्गै रनङ्गातुरैः
सम्पद्येत कथं तदाप्तिसुखमित्येतन्न वेद्मि स्फुटम् ॥

This verse is illustrated by Abhinavagupta in Abhinavabhārati. The lust of Rāvaṇa is picturised here. Sita is an ineligible *Ālambana* to Rāvaṇa as she is the wife of another. So, here it is *Rasābhāsa*. But at the time of reading the verse we do not feel *Hāsya*. But after recollection only we laugh at Ravana. So, this is ineligible but proper. The same theory is applicable in the case of all other sentiments.[36]

आः आकुलाकुलोऽस्मि । शीर्षपादं न जानामि । एतौ तालफल पीनौ कालेय चन्दनालिप्तौ स्तनावधोमुखौ तत्रभवत्याः अधन्यस्य मम जीवन्त्याः अनासादितौ । [37]

This is the lamentation of Śāṅdilya in Bhagavadajjuka at the death of Vasantalatā, a prostitute. Considering Vasantalatā as the *Vibhāva* of both *Sṛngāra* and *Karuṇa*, is an eligible fact, as she is a prostitute previously and now, she is dead. But the way of mixing both and expressing the pathos is improper. So, it results in *Hāsya*.

Sometimes impropriety also comes in support of the main sentiment to which *Hāsya* is subordinating. Jagannātha gives an example as -

ब्रह्मन्नध्ययनस्य नैष समयस्तूष्णीं बहिः स्थीयतां
स्वल्पं जल्प वृहस्पते जडमते नैषा सभा वज्रिणः ।
वीणां संहर नारद स्तुतिकथालारैरलं तुम्बुर
सीतायल्लकभल्लभिन्न हृदयः स्वस्थो क लङ्केश्वरः ॥ [38]

These are the words of Rāvaṇa's gate keeper. It is not proper to a servant to rebuke the deities like Brahman etc, but according to Jagannātha it highlights the lust of Ravana towards Sita.

See the following example where there are both ineligibility and impropriety.

दर्शेन्दुतुल्यवदनाञ्जनपुञ्जगौरी मार्जारचारूनयना घटपीन मध्या ।
प्रोत्लुङ्गपीन कुच चुम्बितनाभिदेशा त्रैलोक्यमोहवसतिः खलु कामिनी सा ॥ [39]

It is in appreciation of the beauty of a queen by a minister in the presence of the king, her husband. It is Anarha -ineligible- and on the other hand the description is improper. So, it certainly results in Hāsya only.

HĀSYĀBHĀSA:

The third thing is *Hāsyābhāsa* which depends on indecency. Abhinavagupta illustrates *Hāsyābhāsa* as

तत्र हास्याभासो यथा अस्पत्पितृव्यस्य वामनगुप्तस्य –

लोकोत्तराणि चरितानि न लोक एषः
सम्मन्यते यदि किमङ्ग वदाम नाम ।
यत्तत्र हास मुखत(र)त्वममुष्य तेन
पाश्वोपपीड मिह को न विजहासीति ॥ [40]

Abhinavagupta has quoted this verse but has not given any explanation. Nor has he given any reference to the context. We find in the above verse only the statement of Hāsa rather than the description of it. It might have been taken into account by Abhinavagupta simply to quote it with reference to Hāsyābhāsa.

Kālidāsa Prahasana, Unmatta Kavikalasa Prahasana Anidrarativīra Prahasana etc., are the monuments of *Hāsyābhāsa*. The descriptions in them naturally go beyond the boundaries of impropriety and sink in indecency, causing only disgust. An example-

नमयन्ति मुखान्यस्य वीक्ष्य शेफो मृगीदृशः ।
मुखमुन्नमयत्येतत् ता विलोक्य मृगीदृशः ॥ [41]

There is no need to explain the indecency in this verse; it is obvious.

But most of the Sanskrit scholars, both ancient and modern, consider it to be *Hāsya* which is aroused by reading the verses, such as the one, mentioned above. They did not bother about the vulgarity and ineptitude in such descriptions. They are of the opinion that one has to accept such verses as proper examples of *Hāsya*.

Thus, the disfigured, the impropriety, and the indecency of *Vibhāva, Anubhāva* etc, result in *Hāsya, Ābhāsahāsya* and *Hāsyābhāsa* respectively. In *Ābhāsahāsya* one may experience the corresponding sentiment and in *Hāsyābhāsa*, one may find Jugupsā too.

SOME CONCEPTS OF BHĀSA ON HĀSYA :-

Bhāsa, though not a rhetorician, anticipated and suggested some of the later theories of *Hāsyā* in his dramas, through certain statements of the characters. While developing the plot, Bhāsa encourages his characters to laugh at situations and dialogues whenever they are funny. On the other hand, he immediately calls for reason and explain the same. Surprisingly almost all his opinions are equally at par levelled with the theories of laughter of western critics.

Generally, people are inclined to laugh at absurdity, discomfiture, incoherence, foolishness and sometimes innocence. The characters of Bhāsa too laugh at the same circumstances.

Let us take his Bālaçarita. There is a conversation between Kamsa and Śāpa as follows-

शापः :- किं न जानीषे माम्? अहंखलु मधूकस्य ऋषेः शापो वज्रबाहुर्नाम –
श्मशानमध्या दहमागतोऽस्मि
चण्डालवेषेण रविरुपचण्डम् ।
कपालमालातिविचित्र वेषः
कंसस्य राज्ञो हृदयं प्रवेष्टुम् ॥

कसः :- असम्भाव्यमर्थं प्रार्थयसि-
सौवर्णकान्ततरकन्दरकूटकुञ्जं
मेरुं न कम्पयति वायसपक्षवातः ।

हास्योऽसि भोः समकरक्षुभितोर्मिमालं
पातु य इच्छति कराञ्जलिना समुद्रम् ॥ [42]

Here, Kamsa feels that it is not easy for a crow to shake the mountain, MEru, and it is not easy to anybody to drink the water of an ocean with both the hands put together. If a man tries to do so he will be laughed at. The impossibility or incongruity lying in it results in *Hāsya*. In the same manner Śāpa also has tried to go deep into the heart of Kamsa and therefore Kamsa laughed at him. So Bhāsa suggests incongruity as an element of *Hāsya*. Here is another example.

In Dūtaghatotkaça, Gatotkaça enters the court of Suyodhana and describes the heroism of Arjuna. There is a discourse: -

घटो :- न क्रोधव्यवसायेन दैवेनैतदुदाहृतम् ।
पश्यामीव हि गाण्डीवी सर्वक्षत्रवधोधृतः ॥

सुयो :- अहो हास्यमभिधानम्

घटो :- किमेतद्धास्यते

सुयो :- एतद्धि हास्यते -
देवैर्मन्त्रयते सार्धं स कृष्णो जातमत्सरः ।
पार्थेनैकेन यो वेत्ति निहतं राजमण्डलम् ॥ [43]

In this conversation also, the incongruity as felt by Suyodhana, lies in the words of Gatotkaça and is laughable. Compare the same opinion of Bhāsa with the explanation of Scot Alexander.

"Not in physical effects alone, but in everything a man can achieve a stroke of superiority in surpassing or discomforting a rival in the disposition of laughter." [44]

Even when Gatotkaça describes the discomfiture of Kāma, Bhāsa has allowed Dhṛtarāṣṭra also to laugh at him.

In AbhishEkanātakā, Bhāsa suggests the element, absurdity. Read the following colloquy between Rāvaṇa and Sītā.

रावणः - (उपेत्य)
सीते त्यज त्वं व्रतमुक्तचर्यं भजस्व मां भामिनि सर्वगात्रैः ।

अपास्य तं मानुषमद्य भद्रे गतायुषं काम पथान्निवृत्तम् ।

सीताः- हास्यः खमु रावणकः यो वचनगत सिद्धमपि न जानामि ।[45]

In the above verse Rāvaṇa abuses Rāma as गतायुष and on the other hand he asks Sītā to forget Rāma. So, the absurdity lying in that makes Sītā laugh at Rāvaṇa.

Both the triumph of self and the discomfiture of others are the elements to laughed at. The feeling of self-eminence or superiority encourages us to laugh at others. What Hobbs says the same (quoted previously).

In Pratijnā Yaugandharāyaṇa, after the elopement of Vāsavadattā with Vatsarāja, Yaugandharāyaṇa was caught by the force of Pradyota. Then a dialogue between a soldier and Yaugandharāyaṇa goes like this,

भटः- आयी अमत्य आह-आयुधागारे तिष्ठतु किल आर्यः पुरुषगुप्तोऽयं देश इति ।

यौगन्ध :- अहो हास्य मभिधानम्-

अग्निं बध्द्वा वत्सराजाभिधानं यस्मिन् काले सर्वतो रक्षितव्यम् ।

तस्मिन्काले सुप्तमासीदमात्यः नीते रत्ने भाजने को निरोधः ॥[46]

Here the eminence of Yaugandharāyaṇa, compared with the inferiority of the king's ministers like Bharatarohaka forced him to laugh at them. When Vatsarāja was absconding from them, those careful ministers were asleep, but now they appear to be cautious. So Yaugandharāyaṇa laughs at the cost of their discomfiture.

Ridicule is one of the elements of *Hāsya*. It is very humourous and cheerful. A conversation between Bharatarohaka and Yaugandharāyaṇa in the same play is as-

भरत - भवतु भवतु महासेनस्य प्रतिकूलं कृत्वा कौशाम्बीं प्रति का कृता ते वृद्धिः ।

यौगन्ध - अहो हास्ययभिधानम्

भवतां श्वग्रतो यातः शेषकार्येषु का कथा ।

समूल वृक्षमुत्पाट्य शाखाश्छेत्तुं कुतः श्रमः ॥[47]

Bharatarohaka was unable to harm Yaugandharāyaṇa, in any manner but he asked Yaugandharāyaṇa how he could go to Kauśāmbi. With in no time, Yaugandharāyaṇa realised the ridiculous nature of Bharatarohaka and laughed at him.

Thus, Bhāsa has suggested the incongruity, superiority feeling, absurdity, and discomfiture of others, as the elements of Hāsya. These are not far from the opinions of the specialised critics on *Hāsya.*

CLASSIFICATION OF HĀSYA

According to Bharata, *Hāsya* is of two kinds namely *Ātmastha* and *Parastha.*

द्विविधश्चायं आत्मस्थः परस्थश्च । यदा स्वयं हसति तदा आत्मस्थः यदा तु परं हासयति तदा परस्थः ।[48]

Though the classification into *Ātmastha* and *Parastha* is proper, the way of explaining them is not as proper and perfect as we expect it to be. Because *Hāsya* is to laugh at something, but it is not *Hāsya* to make others laugh. Moreover, it is questionable whether the classification is based on *Vibhāva Sthāyin* or *Rasa* which are called technically Ālambana, Āśraya and the experience respectively.

If we follow Bharata completely, we have to decide that it is *Ātmastha* if one laughs oneself, and *Parastha* if one encourages others to laugh at. So, one and the same person has to play both the roles of *Adhikāra* and *Vibhāva* at a time as per the different natures of *Hāsya*. But it is not possible. Moreover, according to the definition of Bharata the classification as *Ātmastha* and *Parastha* is possible in every sentiment. Though it is somehow difficult to classify *Śṛngāra* like *Ātmastha* and *Parastha*, in the case of other sentiments like Bhayānaka, Bībhatsa etc., it is too easy. So, I think it is not very useful to classify Hāsya as Ātmastha and Parastha if we completely follow Bharata. It is noteworthy that even Abhinavagupta has not been in favour of the arguments of Bharata in this regard. Read the following-

आत्मस्थ विभावैः विकृतवेषादिभिः विदूषकः स्वयं हसति स तस्यात्मस्थः । देवीञ्च हासयति इति तस्याः परस्थः । तदिदमसत् । एवं हि विभावाना मात्मस्थत्व विभागः स्यात् त तु हास्यस्य । किञ्च स्वामिनः शोकः अनुजीविषु शोकं करोतीति परस्थता सर्वत्र स्यात् । स्वयम्भूर्हि परत्र देव्यादौ व्यक्तः परस्थः इतिचेद्रम्भीरस्य प्रभोरनुजीविगतोऽनुभवव्यक्त क्रोधोऽपि परस्थो भवेत् । तद्विभावः आत्मस्थोऽतोऽन्यविभावकस्त्वन्यः इत्यसत् । परिहासोऽपि तद्धासे विभावःस्यात् । एतच्च रत्यादिषु सर्वेष्वप्यस्ति । [49]

An instigator of *Hāsya* should not experience it at the same time. It is always *Ātmastha* as it is limited only to a person by whom it has been realised. So, the successors of Bharata beginning with Abhinavagupta have defined the terms *Ātmastha* and *Parastha* in a different manner.

Read -

आत्मस्थः परसंस्थश्च त्यस्य भेदद्वयं मतम् ।
आत्मस्थो द्रष्टुरूत्पन्नो विभावेक्षणमात्रतः ॥

हसन्तमपरं दृष्टवा विभावश्चोपजायते ।
योऽसौ हास्यरसस्तद्ज्ञैः परस्थः परिकीर्तितः ॥ [50]

The above definition is based on the contagious nature of *Hāsya* and therefore it is scientifically and logically proved. We may not get angry on seeing an angry person, but we are inclined to laugh when we see a person laughing, though we do not know why that man is laughing. Thus, we laugh at without knowing why. This is the peculiarity of *Hāsya*. Recognising the very fact and the contagious nature of *Hāsya*, the successors of Bharata have rectified the definition in the divisions of *Hāsya*.

So, it is *Ātmastha* to laugh at the *Vibhāva* directly and it is *Parastha* to join with another person that is laughing. The laughter of the first person is the *Vibhāva* to the laughter of the second person. In fact, the general condition of the realisation of *Rasa* does not allow such realisation without the knowledge of the *Vibhāva* and suggests the spectators to imagine the *Vibhāva*, but invariably critics have to admit it in the case of *Hāsya*, as it has already got its existence.

Therefore, the classification of Hāsya based on the abode is defined perfectly by the successors of Bharata. It is not forgettable that Abhinavagupta is the first critic to explain 50. Read-

तस्मादयमत्रार्थः । परं हसन्तं दृष्टवा स्वयं विभावान् अपश्यन्नपि हसन् लोके दृष्टः । तथा विभावादि दर्शनेपि गाम्भीर्यात् अनुचितहासोऽपि परकीय हासावलोकनेन तत्क्षण हासविशेषः सम्पद्यत एवेति स्वभावः । यथा आम्लादि दाडिमादि रसास्वादः सङ्क्रामति । हासः स्वभावतः सङ्क्रमशीलइति कास्य भूयिष्ठता [51]

Śāradātanaya classifying all the sentiments according to the place, time, quality etc.,[52] which cause the variation of experiences, shows threefold division of *Hāsya*, like this-

हास्योऽपि त्रिप्रकारः स्याद्वाङ्नैपथ्याङ्गभेदतः ।
यद्यत्प्रहसनं वाक्यं स हास्यो वाचिकः स्मृतः ॥ [53]

विपर्ययेण निक्षेपो माल्याभरण वाससाम् ।
यस्स नैपथ्यजो हास्य इति निर्णीयते बुधैः ॥

विकटाभिनयत्वं यदङ्गानामवलोकने ।
स्वभावाद्वा कपटात् स हास्यस्त्वाङ्गिको भवेत् ॥ [54]

It is remarkable that Śāradātanaya in the above classification has taken the action *Vāçika, Āhārya* and *Āngika* into account but, ignored the *Sātvikābhinaya* which is psychological. Śāradātanaya might have thought that the *Sātvikābhinaya* being psychological should not be disfigured. But it is not impossible to disfigure even *Sātvikābhinaya* and to create *Hāsya*. For instance, *Aśru* is one of the eight *Sātvikānubhāvās*. One may divert the position of the flow of tears and create *Hāsya*. Likewise*, Vaiśvarya* and *Stambha* are also the actions of *Sāttvikabhāva* but if they are diverted, they evoke *Hāsya*. Moreover, Śāradātanaya has allowed seven of the eight *Sāttvikabhāvas*, omitting Pralaya. [55] So it is to conclude that Śāradātanaya is not against the admission of *Sāttvikabhāvas* in *Hāsya*, but he has not taken them into account to classify *Hāsya*.

Bharata again classifies *Hāsya* into six kinds according to their grades. They are *Smita, Hasita, Vihasita, Apahasita, Upahasita* and *Atihasita*. Among these six *Smita* and *Hasita* are connected with *Uttama*

prakṛti, Vihasita and *Upahasita* are connected with *Madhyamaprakṛti* and *Apahasita* and *Atihasita* with *Adhamaprakṛti* like this-

ईषद्विकसितगण्डैः कटक्षैः सौष्ठवान्वितैः ।
अलक्षितद्विजं धीरमुत्तमानां स्मितं भवेत् ॥

उत्फुल्लानननेत्रन्तु गण्डविकसितैरथ ।
किञ्चिल्लक्षितदन्तश्च हसितं तद्विधीयते ॥

आकुञ्चिताक्षिगण्डं यत् सस्वनं मधुरं तथा ।
कालागतं सास्यरागं तद्विहसितं भवेत् ॥

उत्फुल्लनासिकं यत्तु जिह्मदृष्टि निरीक्षितम् ।
निकुञ्चिताङ्गकशिरः तच्चोपहसितं भवेत् ॥

अस्थानहसितं यत्तु साश्रुनेत्रं तथैव च ।
उत्कम्पितांशुक शिरस्तच्चापहसितं भवेत् ॥

संरम्भ साश्रुनत्रञ्च विकृष्टस्वर मुत्तमम् ।
करोपगूढपार्श्वं च तच्चातिहसितं भवेत् ॥[56]

Abhinavagupta, explaining divisions of the above *Hāsya* informs something more than Bharata. According to him *Smita*, *Vihasita*, and *Apahasita* are to be treated as *Ātmastha* and *Hasita*, *Upahas*ita and *Atihasita* are *Parastha*. For him, the first three get them transformed into the later three respectively as they get polluted. Thus, the first three are pure[57] and the later three are contaminated. Bharata indicates the opinion in the following verse

इत्येष स्वसमुत्थः तथा परसमुत्थश्चेति विज्ञेयः ।
द्विविधिः त्रिप्रकृतिगतः द्व्यवस्थभावो रसो हास्यः ॥[58]

But there are doubts about the explanation of Abhinavagupta. It may be far from experience that Smita, Vihasita and Apahasita being contaminated are bearing Hasita, Upahasita, and Atihasita. It is a known fact that there is a vast difference between direct connection and the connection intermedia. At the second stage as said above, the depth of experience will be somehow less but not more. The theory of contamination of Hāsya of Abhinavagupta is acceptable but the distinction marked by him may not be proper. Moreover, as the contagious Hāsya has no strong hold or firm basis, it begets

doubt and doubt comes in the way of deep laughter. On the other hand, as that Hāsya depends on some other person, it has no freedom to develop. So how can the contagious be stronger and denser than the original, independent and strongly based Hāsya? At times the contaminated *Hāsya* may completely be disconnected with the *Vibhāva* of original *Hāsya*.

Bharata has enriched the subject of the classification of *Hāsya* with one additional remarkable opinion. It is open that the sentiments are the products of the spectators. So, all the divisions of all sentiments and at present the divisions of *Hāsya* should also have been originated from the spectators. The primary classification of *Hāsya* into *Ātmastha* and *Parastha* prove the above fact. To speak strictly of the varieties of *Hāsya*, they are not the divisions of experience but of different physical movements, technically called *Anubhāvās*. So, the physical movements are less important in the spectators than in the actors. As the actors have to stir the sentiments in the spectators by their expressions and physical movements, they should possess clear physical movements. Recognising the fact Bharata has extended the varieties of *Hāsya* to the actors also according to the status of the character.

हास्य स्थानानि यानि स्युः कार्योत्पन्नानि नाटके ।
उत्तमाधम मध्याना मेवं तानि प्रदर्शयेत् ॥ [59]

There is another important point in the classification of *Hāsya*. We know that *Śṛngāra* is classified on the basis of its different stages, and *Vīra* on different objects. But *Hāsya* is classified on the basis of different physical movements. Where is the necessity or propriety in classifying the sentiments based on different elements and especially the *Hāsya* on physical movements only? If the physical movements are considerable while classifying the sentiments why are not, they considered in the classifications of other sentiments? Thus, it appears all the divisions of *Hāsya* like Smita etc., are not really the divisions of *Hāsya*. They are just the movements which suggest the depth of the entertainment of the spectators.

The main reason for this, I think is, the constant reactions of *Hāsya*. Laughter is an instinct and a physical reflexion of certain mood of all human beings. It may differ from man to man, but reflexion is the same, and the reaction is constant. There may be a difference in lip movement, but it is common. Bharata has taken into account the constant physical movements of certain cadres of the spectators to explain their cheerful feeling or delight and has classified the *Hāsya* into six kinds. However, this classification of *Hāsya* doesn't help to supplement the aesthetic experience of *Hāsya* like the divisions of other sentiments. These divisions may indicate the difference in action but not in reason or experience.

But if we are particular in the classification of *Hāsya*, the classification done by Śāradātanaya is a better help. It is based on the analysis of *Vibhāvās* which belong to dialogue, make-up and action. Even in these three, the varieties of make-up and action are innumerable and therefore they are not to be defined. But, *Hāsya* based on dialogue connected with its sense and sentiments is however be classified and explained to some extent. We take into account certain constant and powerful qualities of the word, sense and substance and divide and explain various types of *Hāsya*. Modern critics on *Hāsya* in many languages are in favour of the classification based on word and sense mainly. So, I also do list and explain the varieties of *Hāsya* giving importance to *Hāsya* based on dialogue in the penultimate chapter. Here I give examples for *Hāsya* based on make-up (*Āhārya*) and action (*Āgikābhinaya*). Out of these two, *Āgikābhinaya* is seen very much in every Prahasana. For instance, the action of Kapāla and Devasoma in Mattavilāsa Prahasana, the movements of most of the characters in LaṭakamElaka and Hāsyārṇava Prahasana etc., are the examples of the *Hāsya* arising from the action.

See the following example for Aahāya -

पानीयस्थूल पादे कथमपि धरया धारिते साङ्कुरौघे
हस्तन्यस्ताञ्चलाग्र प्रचलितपवनैर्वारयन् मक्षिकालीम् ।
कासात् कण्ठ स्वनौघैः सपदि मुखरयन् दिङमुखं व्योमवीथी

मप्येष व्याधिसिन्धुः प्रविशति सरूजा मन्तको राजवैद्यः ॥ [60]

Of the nine said sentiments *Hāsya* and *Bībhatsa* are of certain individualities, *Hāsya* in particular. Jagannatha in Rasagangādhara says as-

ननु रति क्रोधोत्साह भय शोक विस्मयादिषु प्रागुदाहृतेषु यथा आलम्बनाश्रययोः सम्प्रत्ययः न तथा हामे जुगुप्सायाञ्च । तत्रालम्बनस्यैव प्रतीतेः । पद्यश्रोतुस्च रसास्वाधिकरणत्वेन लौकिक हास जुगुत्साश्रयत्वानुपपत्ते रिति चे त्सत्यम् । तदाश्रयश्च द्रष्टृ पुरुष विशेषस्य तत्र आक्षेप्यत्वात् । श्रोतु स्वीयकान्ता वर्णन पद्यादिव रसोद्बोधेबाधकाभावात् । [61]

In general, while getting the aesthetic experience, we find Ālambana and Āśraya. They are essential in attaining the eternal bliss. For instance, the hero and the heroine are the essential characters in Sṛngāra in order to attain it. In Karuṇa, the dead one is Ālambana and his mourning relatives, are Āśraya. But in Hāsya and Bībhatsa we find only one of them resulting in the aesthetic experience. The Ālambana can only lead the spectator to the word of experience without asylum (*Āśraya*). See the examples for Bībhatsa and *Hāsya* respectively-

सुराङ्गनाभिराश्लिष्टा व्योम्नि वीरा विमानगाः ।
विलोकन्ते निजान्देहान् फेरूनारीभि रावृतान् ॥ [62]

श्रीतात पादै र्निहिते निबन्ध निरूपिता नूतन युक्ति रेषा ।
अङ्गं गवां पूर्वमहो पवित्रं कथं न वा रासभ धर्म पत्न्याः ॥ [63]

In these two verses there is only *Ālambana*. In spite of it, one can realise both *Bībhatsa* and *Hāsya* respectively on reading these verses. If we question the possibility of aesthetic experience in them Jagannātha humbly replies in two ways i.e., to draw the *Āśraya* from elsewhere or to enjoy without asylum. Generally, there is no need of the asylum, and even without it we can laugh at the situation. We have to play a dual role as the asylum and the entertained. 64

Here, it is my duty to raise and clarify a doubt. Unlike the sentiment *Hāsya*, is it not possible to get the aesthetic experience through other sentiments without asylum? See the following examples of *Karuṇa* and *Sṛngāra* respectively-

अपहाय सकल बान्धव चिन्ता मुद्वास्य गुरुकुल प्रणयम् ।
हा तनय विनय शालिन् कथ मिव परलोक पथकोऽभूः ॥ [64]

शयिता सविधेप्यनीश्वरा सफलीकर्तु महो मनोरथान् ।
दयिता दयिताननाम्बुजं दरमीलन्नयना निरीक्षते ॥ [65]

In these verses we realise both *Karuṇa* and *Sṛngāra* respectively without the help of asylum. Abhinavagupta says that one's lamentations do not stir *Karuṇa* but *Rasābhāsa* only if the dead is not, one's kin. Why did he say thus? For this we have to deal with the social and psychological traditions and conditions. Naturally we can laugh at a person or situation even though we have no acquaintance or vicinity to the person involved in it. A disorder or an oddity at a glance evokes laughter. None can deny our right to laugh at these. But this rule is not applicable in the case of *Sṛngāra*. The experience of love with an unacquainted lady is not allowed in this society. It leads to certain other consequences. Similarly in the case of *Karuṇa* also, it may not be possible to experience pity directly without the corresponding *Ālambana*. Moreover, human tendency generally tries to ignore the pathetic events which are not closely connected with them. The same theory holds good in the case of other sentiments and moods also. The same social theory is applicable even on the stage in the case of a drama. The only cause for the absence of that defect in *Hāsya* is that, it is an embodiment of happiness both in the society and on the stage. Here we have to remember the way of the classification of *Hāsya* as *Ātmastha* and Parastha which is not seen in connection with any other sentiment. *Ātmastha* is that where there is only *Ālambana*, and *Parastha* is that where there are both *Ālambana* and *Āśraya*. Moreover, we can say that one can experience *Hāsya* without *Ālambana*. One can laugh at something unknown. The unique feature of *Hāsya,* is that it will be entertained without either *Ālambana* or *Āśraya*. Of course it is applicable to *Bībhatsa* also.

Hāsya has close attachment with *Sṛngāra*. Though *Sṛngāra* mixed with *Hāsya* is called *Sṛngārābhāsa*, there is no cherishing *Sṛngāra* without polite *Hāsya*. It could be well enjoyed with closer

association of *Hāsya*, but not with all its divisions. *Hāsya* subserves *Śṛngāra* rather than any other sentiment. We often see *Hāsya* in the works in which *Śṛngāra* is predominant. But the divisions of *Hāsya* like mockery, irony, satire etc., prevail in good amount in *Vīra* and *Raudra* also. Moreover, every sentiment turns into *Hāsya* if parodied. Even in *Śāntarasa* a gentle smile is helpful.

Man's experiences in the world are of two kinds, the happy and the sorrowful.[66] As rhetoricians have denoted, Rati, Utsāha, Hāsa and Vismaya give pleasure and Krodha, Bhaya, Śoka and Jugupsa are sorrowful. [67] As *Hāsa* is one of the pleasurable moods, it should be the closest connection with the remaining three cheerful sentiments. So, *Hāsa* has enmity with the four sorrowful moods and their corresponding sentiments. Read the following -

आद्यः करुण बीभत्स रौद्रवीर भयानकैः ।
भयानकेन करूणेनापि हास्यो विरोधभाक् ॥

करूणो हास्य शृङ्गार रसाभ्यामपि तादृशः ।
रौद्रस्तु हास्यशृङ्गार भयानकरसैरपि ॥

शृङ्गार वीर रौद्राख्य हास्य शान्त र्भयानकः ।
शान्तस्तु वीरशृङ्गार रौद्र हास्य भयानकैः ॥
शृङ्गरेण तु बीभत्सः इत्याख्याता विरुद्धता ॥ [68]

Thus, *Hāsya* is opposed to *Bhayānaka, Karuṇa, Raudra* and *Śānta*. Except *Śānta*, all the other three which have enmity with *Hāsya* are sorrowful. Adbhuta has no enmity with any of the sentiments. So, if a poet wants to develop *Hāsya* in connection with any of the four sorrowful sentiments, there are certain ways paved by critics. Read –

विवक्षिते रसे लब्ध प्रतिष्ठे तु विरोधिनाम् ।
बाध्यानामङ्गभावं वा प्राप्ताना मुक्तिरच्छला ॥ [69]

एषा मङ्गाङ्गि भावेन सङ्करो मम सम्मतः ॥ [70]

स्मर्यमाणो विरुद्धोऽपि साम्येनाथ विवक्षितः ।
अङ्गिन्यङ्गत्वमाप्तौ यौ तो न दुष्टौ परस्परम् ॥ [71]

The following is the consolidated list of all of the ways mentioned above. Theory of comparative intention (साम्य विवज्ञा), theory of Sub-ordination (अङ्गाङ्गिभौवः) theory of foils (बाध्यबाध्कभावः), Co-existence of two Subordinate Rasas, theory of recollection and the theory of important and unimportant (साधारण विशेष भावः). This enmity is also of two kinds - namely स्थिति विरोध (enmity of asylum) and ज्ञान विरोध (enmity in knowledge). The enmity of the first kind can be removed by putting these two different sentiments at different Substratum. The enmity of the Second kind is to be removed by connecting it with another Rasa which is a friend to both of them. [72]

Here we have to implement these rules in removing the enmity between Hāsya and any of the four namely *Raudra Karuṇa, Bhayānaka,* and *Śānta*.

In Bhagavadajjuka Prahasana, VasantasEna dies of snake-bite. Ṡānḍilya mourns her death. But impropriety renders it laughable, bringing *Hāsya*. But his master being above all these mundane matters preaches transience of all human beings. Here we have to realise *Śānta.* Please follow the following:

शाण्डिल्यः :- अपेहि अकरुण ! निस्स्नेह ! कर्कश हृदय ! दुष्ट बुद्ध ! भिन्नचारित्र ! क्रूर ! शठ ! मुधा मुण्ड ... नामाष्टशतं ते पूरयिष्यामि । - आः आकुलाकुलोऽस्मि शीषीपदं न जानामि । एतौ ताल फल पीनौ कालेय चन्दनालिप्तौ स्तनावधोमुखौ तत्र भवत्याः अधन्यस्य मम जीवन्त्याः अनासादितौ ।

परिव्राजकः :- स्वकर्म भोवतुं जायन्ते प्रायेणैव हि जन्तवः ।
क्षीणे कर्मणि चान्यत्र पुनर्गच्छन्ति देहिनः ॥

ये निर्ममाः मोक्षमनुप्रपन्नाः शास्त्रोपदिष्टेन पथा प्रयान्ति ।
तेषामपि प्रीति पराङ्मुखानां गुणेष्ववेक्षां हृदय करोति ॥ [73]

But the asylums of both *Hāsya* and *Ṡānta* being Ṡānḍilya and Parivrājaka respectively are different. So, enmity between these two has been removed.

ज्ञानविरोध (Enmity in knowledge) is to be removed by inserting another sentiment which supports both the conflicting *Rasās.* Generally,

Adbhuta plays its part in removing the second type of enmity as *Adbhuta* has no enmity with any of the sentiments.

Jnānarāśi is an astrologer. His disciple Kaunḍinya asks him to teach astrology. Jnānarāśi tries his best to avoid him, but in an inevitable situation he begins to teach him astrology and describes the tricks underlying it, which provoke laughter. But with the entry of KapatakEli, with her servant the stage moves towards *Śānta*. For that effect an incident of wonder is described in between those two. Read -

बृह्मे वाहं मरणमथवा जीवितं वेद्मि जन्तोः
स्वामीवाहं परहृतधनं क्ष्मातलादुद्धरामि ।
लोकस्याहं सकल चरिता न्यन्तरात्मेव जाने
चौरैगुप्तं स्वयमिव हृतं वस्त्वहं प्रापयामि ॥ [74]

Hāsya peeps into all *Rasasa*. It prevails not only in *Vibhāva* but also in *Anubhāva*, *Vyabhiçāribhāvās* and *Sāttvikabhāva* also. So, a writer must be very careful in order to avoid the formation of *Hāsya* while dealing with other sentiments.

Hāsya can be enjoyed by all people without any age restriction. *Śṛngāra* is mainly intended for youth, and *Śānta* for old people. A child does not enjoy *Raudra*. But in the case of *Hāsya* there is not any difference or restriction regarding the age of its spectators. Almost all the people enjoy *Hāsa* and therefore it is vital to life as well as to literature.

FOOT-NOTES

1) Nāṭya Śāstra	5-49,50
2) Ibid	6-39
3) Ibid	6-40
4) Abhinavabhāratī	vol I p 295
5) Loḍana	P 179
6) Abhinavabhāratī	vol I p 296
7) बहवोऽर्था विभाव्यन्ते वागङ्गाभिनयाश्रयाः । अनेन यस्मात्तेनायं विभाव इति संज्ञितः ॥	Nātyaśāstra 7/4
8) ललिता ललिताभासा भावाः शृङ्गार हास्ययोः	Bhāvaprakāśana 1/37
9) Ibid	1-41, 42
10) Nāṭya Śāstra	vol I p 312
11) Kāvyānuśāsana	2-34
12) Rasataraṅgiṇi	2-4
13) Nāṭya Śāstra	21-73 74
14) Sāhityaḍintāmaṇi	P 47
15) Bhāvaprakāśana	3-61 to 63
16) Abhinavabhāratī	vol I p 296
17) Ibid	vol I p 280
18) वागङ्गाभिनयेनेह यतस्त्वर्थोऽनुभाव्यते ॥ शाखाङ्गोपाङ्ग संयुक्तस्त्वनुभावस्ततः स्मृतः ॥	Nātyaśāstra 7/5
19) Rasārṇavasudhākara	1-190, 191
20) Nātya Śāstra	P 313
21) Ibid	26-90
22) विविध माभिमुख्येन रसेषु चरन्ततीति व्यभिचारिणः	Nātyaśāstra 7/27
23) Nāṭya śāstra	P 313
24) Hāsyārṇava Prahasana	P 32

25) Bhagavadajjuka P 29

26) अनौचित्य प्रावृतानां काम क्रोधादि कारणात् ।
भावानाञ्च रसानाञ्च बन्ध ऊर्जस्वि कथ्यते Kāvyālañkāra Sangraha 4/5

27) Kāvyālañkāra Sangraha 4-3

28) Dhvanyāloka P 330

29) Rasagangādhara P366

30) Auçitya Viçāra Çarçā P7

31 Rasārṇava Sudhākara 2-263

32) Bhāvaprakāśana 6 17 to 20

33) Sṛñgāratilakam

34) Ekāvalī P 120 121

ननु तिर्यङ्म्लेच्छगतयो राभासत्वं न युज्यते । तयोर्विभावादि सम्भवात् । असम्भवे नास्वादयोग्यता इति चेन्न । भोः म्लेच्छारसवादिन्! उत्कलाधिपतेः शृङ्गार रसाभिमानिनो नरसिम्हदेवस्य चित्तमनुवर्तमानेन विद्याधरेण कविना वाढ मभ्यन्तरीकृतोऽसि । एवं खलु समर्थित मेकावल्या मनेन । अपरे तु रसाभासं तिर्यक्षु प्रचक्षते । तन्न परीक्षाक्षनम् । तेष्वपि विभावादि सम्भवात् । विभावादि ज्ञान शून्यास्तिर्यञ्चो न भाजनं भवितुमर्हति रसस्येति चेन्न । मनुष्येष्वपि केषुचित्तथाभूतेषु रसविषय भावाभावप्रसङ्गात् । अत्र विभावादि सम्भावोऽपि रसं प्रतिप्रयोजकः न विभावादि ज्ञानम् । तत स्तिरश्चामस्त्येव रस इति । न तावता तिरश्चां विभावत्वमुपपद्यते । शृङ्गारे हि समुज्ज्वलस्य शुचिनो दर्शनीयस्यैव वस्तुनो मुनिना विभावत्वेनाम्नानात् । तिरश्चा मुद्वर्तन मज्जन कल्परचनाद्यभावात् । उज्ज्वल शुचि दर्शनीयत्व सम्भावना असम्भावना प्रसिद्धैव । अथ स्वजातियोग्यधर्मैः करिणः करिणीं प्रति विभावत्वमिति चेन्न । तस्यां कक्ष्यायां करिणः करिणी रागं प्रति कारणत्वं न पुर्नावभावत्वम् । किञ्च जातियोग्यधर्मैर्वस्तुनो न विभावत्वमपितु भावक चित्तोल्लास हेतुभिरतिविशिष्टैरेव । किञ्च विभावादि ज्ञानं नामौचित्यविवेकः । तेन शून्यास्तिर्यञ्चो न विभावतां यान्ति । तर्हि विभावादि ज्ञान रहितेषु मनुष्येषु रसाभास प्रसङ्गः इति चेन्नैष दोषः । विवेक रहित जनोपलक्षणम्लेच्छगतस्य रसस्य आभासत्वे स्वेष्टावप्तेः। किञ्च विभावादि सम्भवोपि रसं प्रति प्रयोजको न हि विभावादि ज्ञान मित्येतत् न युज्यते । तथा विभावादे र्विशिष्टस्य वस्तुमात्रस्य वा सम्भवो रसंप्रति प्रयोजकः । विशिष्टप्रयोजकत्वाङ्गीकारे विवेकादि प्रवेशोङ्गीकृत इति अस्मदनुसरणं शरणं गतोऽसि । अत्र विवेकं विना तदितर विशेषवत्वं वैशिष्ट्य मितिचेन्न । विशेषणानां धर्मिणि परमोकर्षानुसंधान तप्पराणा मन्योन्य सहिष्णूना मियत्तया नियमासम्भवात् -

35) Rasagañgādhara P 30

36) तेन करुणाद्याभासेष्वपि हास्यत्वं सर्वेषु मन्तव्यम् ।
अनौचित्य प्रवृत्ति कृत मेव हि हास्य विभावत्वम् ।
तच्चानौचत्यं सर्व रसानां विभावानुभावदौ सम्भवात् ॥

37) Bhagavadajjuka P 23

38) Rasagañgādhara P 217

39) Hāsyārṇava Prahasana 1-43

40) Abhinavabhārati vol I P 296

41) Kālidāsa Prahasana P 41

42) Bālaçarita 2 5,6

43) Dūtaghatōtkaça P 38

44) Taken From Encyclopaedia Britanica vol I-P6

45) Abhiṣekanāṭaka

46) Pratijnāyaugandharāyaṇa

47) Ibid

48) Nāṭya Śāstra P 313

49) Abhinavabhārati vol I pp 313, 14

50) Rasagangaadhara P 183

51) Abhinavabhaarati vol I pp 314, 15

52) देश कालगुण द्रव्य क्रिया जात्यात्मकेषु तु ।
अनुभूतेषु भावेषु यथावस्थित रूपतः ॥
येन येन च भावेन यादृशो जायते रसः ।
तत्तद्भावाख्यया सूरिः बोध्यते तादृशो रसः ॥
Bhāvaprakāśana pp. 3/115, 116

53) Ibid 3-110

54) Ibid 3-121 to 123

55) सात्विका हास्य सम्पत्तौ सर्वे प्रलय वजिताः ।

56) Naatya Saastra 6-54 to 59

57) स्वसमुत्थ इत्यसङ्क्रान्तः स्मितविसितापहसितलक्षणः ।
पर समुत्थः सङ्क्रान्तः हसितोपसितातिहसित रूपः ॥

Abhinavabhārati vol. I p. 316
58) Naatya Saastra 6-61
59) Ibid 6-60
60) Hāsyārṇava Prahasana 1-30
61) Rasagañgādhara P 186
62) Ibid P 125
63) Ibid P 182
64) Ibid P 155
65) Ibid P 137
66) योऽयं स्वभावो लोकस्य सुख दुःख समन्वितः ।
सोऽङ्गाभिनयोपेतः नाट्यमित्यभिधीयते ॥ Nāṭya Śāstra 1/119
67) Abhinavabhārati vol I pp 219, 20
63) Sahityadarpaṇa 3-244 to 248
69) Dhvanyāloka 3-20
70) Rasārṇavasudhākara 3-254
71) Kāvyaprakāśa 7-65
72) आश्रयैक्ये विरुद्धो यः स कार्यो भिन्नसंश्रयः Kāvyaprakāśa 7/26
एकाश्रयत्वे निर्दोषो नैरन्तर्ये विरोधिनाम् ।
रसान्तरव्यवधिना रसो व्यङ्गयः सुमेधसा ॥ Dhvanyālokah 3/26
73) Bhagavadajjuka P 23
74) Hāsyaçūḍāmaṇi Prahasana 1-21

COMIC ELEMENTS IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

COMIC ELEMENTS IN THE VEDAS AND THE ITIHAASAS

H*āsya*, though not specifically treated in *Vedās* and *Itihāsās*, has its elements in them whenever there was scope for its appearance. We can easily find out certain fragments of pure and simple *Hāsya* in *Vedās* and *Itihāsās* which entertain us.

Bharata stated that Lord Brahman had taken the sentiments from *Atharvaveda* at the time of creating *Nāṭya*. Read-1

जग्राह पाठ्यं ऋग्वेदात्सामभ्यो गीतमेव च ।
यजुर्वेदा दभिनयान् रसानाथर्वणादपि ॥ [1]

The accuracy in saying, रसानाथर्वणादपि is not astonishing and one can agree with him easily after a glance at *Atharvaveda*.[2] There are fragments of certain sentiments and most attractive poetic beauties in *Ṛgveda* itself. Varanasi Dharmasuri in the introductory part of *Sāhitya Ratnākara* has given proper examples for some of the sentiments such as *Ṡṛngāra*, *Vīra*, *Bhayānaka* etc, from *Ṛgveda* in which *Hāsya* is not included. Now, let us see some of the simple, suitable and humorous bits pertaining to *Hāsya* from *Ṛgveda*.

A happy man understands the world better and makes a sincere attempt to look at the bright side of the life. He has that rare sense of humour to laugh even at his own misery and entertains the spectators. In a *Sūkta* which is attributed to Kavaṣa, it is said-

समां तपन्त्यभितः सपत्नीरिव पर्शवः ।
निबाधतेऽ मति र्नग्नता जसुर्वे नं वेवीयते मतिः ॥ ṚGVEDA 10-33-2.

This is the soliloquy of a man with hunger. “I suffer from weak ribs, weak due to hunger as they press me on both sides, just as the two wives of a man do. I am hurt by poverty and foolishness. To stand naked makes me miserable. I am as weak and distressed as a bird hit by a hunter, and I am afraid of my foe.” The simile in the

first half of the above verse provokes laughter. Similarity between the ribs and the fellow-wives is humourous.

The desires of women especially of those suffering from their husband's mistresses seem very strange; yet they are not uncommon in society. From the 146th *Sūkta* of the same *Maṇḍala*, let me quote some of the desires of a lady worried about her husband's mistress, while praising the deity, a creeper namely *Pāṭha*-

उत्तराह मुत्तर उत्तरेदुत्तरेभ्यः । अथा सपत्नी या ममाधरा साधराभ्यः ।
न ह्यस्या नाम गृभ्णामि नो अस्मिन्नमते जने । परामेव परावतं सपत्नीं गमयामसि । V. 3, 4

"I want to be the greatest among the greatest women and my fellow wife, I wish, to be the lowest among the lowest women. I will not just pronounce her name, no-body can love one's fellow-wife and I wish to keep her far from her (our) husband". These desires in particular, "I will not just pronounce her name" are very humourous, expressing the envy of women.

The Hymn of the Gambler seems to be the most witty and humourous among the Hymns in *Ṛgveda*. The peculiarity both in the matter and manner in this Hymn is highly remarkable and enjoyable. Let us see a verse.

यदादीध्ये न दविषाण्येभिः
परायद्भ्यो ऽ वहीये सखिभ्यः ।
न्युप्ताश्च बभ्रवो वाचमक्रत
एमीदेषां निष्कृतं जारिणीव ॥ [3]

"When I think of myself, I will not go with them. I shall be left behind by my friends as they depart (to play), and brown ones thrown down have raised their voice, I go straight like a courtesan to the place of assignation".[4]

Though we consider his case with sympathy, it invites our laughter too. A gambler, in spite of his heavy losses, cannot abstain from the vice, and pursues the thorny path. We see the pitiable position of his life from which we learn many lessons but not himself.

द्वेष्टि श्वश्रू रप जाया रुणद्धि
न नाथतो विन्दते मर्डितारम् ।
अश्वस्येव जरतो वस्न्यस्य
नाहं विन्दामि कितवस्य भोगम् ॥ [5]

"My mother-in-law hates me, my wife drives me away, the man in distress finds none to pity him. I find no more use in a gambler than in an aged horse that is for sale".[6] Thus he feels sorry but follows the way, he practised. But this gentleman at last tries to teach us a lesson, as follows:

अक्षैर्मा दीव्यः कृषिमित्कृषिस्व
वित्ते रमस्व बहु मन्यमानः ।
तत्र गावः कितव तत्र जाया
तन्मा विचष्टे सवितायमर्यः ॥ [7]

Perhaps, he might not have known that bare words do not buy barely. This is a fine satirical comedy full of humour which stands as a guideline to the satires in the later periods of the classical Sanskrit Literature.

Next to Vedic Literature, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata and Śrīmadbhāgavata stands as the main work both in quality and quantity. Rāmāyaṇa is the first poem and the principle root of the classical Sanskrit Literature. Though, it came out spontaneously from the deep sorrowful heart of Vālmīki, it has contributed its best to comic. At the beginning of Rāmāyaṇa Vālmīki says as-

रसैः शृङ्गार कारुण्य हास्य वीर भयानकैः ।
रौद्रादिभिश्च संयुक्तं काव्यमेत दगायताम् ॥ [8]

The comic is also approved as having the counterbalance with the other sentiments. Vālmīki enchants the hearts of readers with humourous dialogues, characters, sequences of incidents, personalities and descriptions. Let us examine some of them.

In Ayōdhyākāṇḍa, after taking a decision to coronate Rāma as the Crown Prince, Dasaratha comes to his court and asks his courtiers

to reveal their opinions on his decision. But after getting their acceptance with cheers he once again questions them, like this -

शृत्वैव वचनं यन्मे राघवं पति मिच्छथ ।
राजा नस्संशयोऽ यं मे कि मिदं ब्रूत तत्वतः ॥

कथं नु मयि धर्मेण पृथिवी मनुशासति ।
भवन्तो द्रष्टुमिच्छन्ति युवराजं ममात्मजम् ॥ [9]

This is simply a joke to entertain his courtiers on that happy occasion.

In the same kāṇḍa, Vālmīki has introduced a very simple character to lighten the seriousness of the situation.

As per the desire of Kaikeyī, Rāma was about to leave for forest. All his people were very much distressed. To lighten the seriousness at that juncture Vālmīki has introduced a *Brāhmin*, who comes to beg something, being forced by his nagging wife. He says to Rāma

निर्धनो बहुपुत्रोऽस्मि राजपुत्र महायशाः ।
उञ्छवृत्ति र्वने नित्यं प्रत्यवेक्षस्व मामिति ॥ [10]

Rāma accepts his appeal and just for fun asks the *Brāhmin* to hurl a stick and promises to give him help in proportion to the capacity shown by him in hurling the stick. That poor *Brāhmin* accepts that challenge and hurls the stick with all his strength. The stick goes away crossing the streams of Sarayu. Rāma appreciates him and gives a lot along with apology for testing him. Then Rāma declares as मन्यु र्न खलु कर्तव्यः परिहासोह्ययं मम । [11] "This comic episode here in Ayōdhyākāṇḍa rightly proves the high ordered merit of Vālmīki in nourishing the sentiment of comic.

There are two peculiar characters in Rāmāyaṇa with Super-natural personalities for the merriment of the readers. They are Hanumān and Kumbhakarṇa. The skill of Vālmīki is clearly seen in the delineation of these two characters. In these two, the character of Hanumān is natural, whereas the second is purely imaginary. Observe the following verse in which the nature and activities of a

monkey are described in Hanumān, who is a supernatural monkey. After seeing Manḍodari by the side of Rāvaṇa in one and the same bed, he mistakes her for Sita and behaves as follows -

आस्फोटयामास चुचुम्ब पुच्छं
ननन्द चिक्रीड जगौ जगाम।
स्तम्भानरोहन्निपपात भूमौ
सन्दर्शयन् स्वां प्रकृतिं कपीनाम् ॥ [12]

With his previous achievements like flying over the sea etc., Hanumān is considered to be a supernatural person. But immediately after reading the above description, we feel that Hanumān is only a monkey. Our hearts open and simple smile dances on our lips. In the same manner, when the monkeys started destroying the *Madhuvana* after learning the where-abouts of Sīta, we find some charming and delightful descriptions of their behaviour. For instance.

गावन्त मन्यः प्रहसन्नुनैति
हसन्त मन्यः प्ररुदन्नुपैति।
रुदन्तमन्यः प्रणुदन्नुपैति
नुदन्तमन्यः प्रणदन्नुपैति ॥ [13]

Here in this verse, not only the sense but also the sounds are comical. In the case of the picturisation and characterisation of supernatural personality of Kumbhakarṇa, Vālmīki is to be well-appreciated. It is an imaginary character and beyond the common human nature. His huge mountain-like body, his eccentric habits and his unique behaviour, are all dealt with unparalleled dexterity and extra-ordinary intelligence. Fundamentally Vālmīki's plan to keep Kumbhakarṇa asleep for six months are more, is a land mark of his genius. The efforts made by the *Asurās* to wake him up before the scheduled time invite peals of laughter from the audience.

Vālmīki has described the comic on a large Seale in Rāmāyaṇa. The scene in Sundarakāṇḍa where Hanumān visits the harem of the demon king is brought out in all humour and imagination. Here is an example

डिण्डिमं परिहृत्यान्या तथैवासक्तडिण्डिमा ।
प्रसुप्ता तरुणं वत्स मुपगुह्येव भामिनी ॥ [14]

At times Vālmīki enriches *Hāsya* with a simple word. When Rāvaṇa asked his servants to awake Kumbhakarṇa, Vālmīki composes a verse as--

नव षट् सप्त चाष्टौ च मासान् स्वपिति राक्षसः ।
मन्त्रयित्वा प्रसुप्तोऽय मितस्तु नवमे दिने ॥ [15]

Here, the word *Rākṣasa* representing Kumbhakarṇa is really a simple joke.

Mahābhārata is the encyclopaedia of human life especially with the odds and sods of the Hindu undivided family.

All the nine sentiments, headed by *Śānta* and *Vīra* are involved in *Mahābhārata*. *Hāsya* is also one of the nine.

In Sabhāparva, Suyōdhana attends Dharmarāja's *Rājasūya*. During his stay in *Mayasabha*, he is thrilled at the miraculous and the mysterious construction. The difficulties he faced and the optical illusions he met with in Mayasabha make him falter and provoke laughter. For instance,

स्फाटिक तल मासाद्य जल मित्यभिशङ्कया ।
स्व वस्त्रोत्कर्षणं राजा कृतवान् बुद्धिमोहितः ॥

ततः स्फाटिक तोयां वै स्फाटिकाम्बुजशोभिताम् ।
वापीं मत्वा स्थलमिति सवासाः प्रापतज्जले ॥ [16]

Here, his mistaking dryland for a water pool and vice versa causes laughter. Though his position is sympathetic, it results in laughter. Even in our regular course of life, we see many such instances, where laughter is our initial response. The same is applicable in the case of Suyōdhana also.

Virāṭaparva in Mahābhārata contributes much to comic with its unique episodes and unparalleled characters. It begins with the description of the lust of Kīchaka. He tries to entice Draupadi but in

vain. It is *Rasābhāsa*.[17] It is a tragic episode to Kīchaka but a comic feature to the readers and certain other characters like Bhīmasena. Let us examine a statement of Bhīmasena consoling Draupadi.

तत्रास्ति शयनं भीरु दृढाङ्गं सुप्रतिष्ठितम् ।
तत्रास्य दर्शयिष्यामि पूर्वप्रेतान् पितामहान् ॥ [18]

"There I show him his fore-fathers already dead" is merely a joke with much "*Vakrōkti*". He once again talks to Kīchaka in the same manner. When Kīchaka entered the 'Nartanaśāla' and mistook Bhimasena for Draupadi,

दिष्ट्या त्वं दर्शनीयोऽसि दिष्ट्यात्मानं प्रशंससि ।
ईदृशस्तु त्वया स्पर्शः स्पृष्टपूर्वो न कर्हिचित् ॥ [19]

Next, the disfigured of Arjuna ie., Bṛhannalā, in the same parva provokes laughter. Uttara, the prince of Virāṭa wants Bṛhannalā to drive his chariot to attack the Kaurava force and asks him to wear the armour. Then Bṛhannalā pretends as if he does not know how to wear and speaks thus--

ऊर्ध्व मुत्क्षिप्य कवचं शरीरे प्रत्यमुञ्चत ।
कुमायंस्तत्र तं दृष्ट्वा प्राहसुः पृथुलोचनाः ॥ [20]

All the above-mentioned instances from the Vedic and Classical literature show that they have also contributed their best to *Hāsya.* However, this is not a complete study of *Hāsya* in those works. There are certain fragments pointing out the way of nourishing comic. Disfigured, disorderliness, *Vakrōkti*, simple jokes etc. are the basic elements accepted by them to evolve *Hāsya*.

In Bhāgavata, which is devoted to glorify the omnipotence and omniscience of Lord Vishṇu and his incarnations, there is comic here and there.

Lord Śiva after knowing how his wife Sati immolated herself in fire, runs up to destroy the *Yajna* of Dakṣa. In that very context Vyāsa had given a lively and humourous account of the participants as they ran helter-skelter, frightened by Śiva's ire.

केचि द्वभञ्जुः प्राग्वंशं पत्नी शाला मथापरे ।
सद आग्नीध्रशालाञ्च तद्विहार महानसम् ॥

रुरुजुर्यज्ञपात्राणि तर्थकेग्नीनशामयन्
कुण्डेष्वमूत्रयन् केचित् बिभिदुर्वेदि मेखलाम् ॥ [21]

Here the behaviour of *Ṛtvics*, extinguishing the fire is quite against their duties and thus invites laughter. In the second half of the second verse quoted above, a cheap type of description is given. It may be a fact, but it hurts the sublimity of the characters like *Ṛtvics*. Bhāgavata as a *Purāṇa* may admit such description, but it should not be persuaded in the case of classical literature. In the tenth Skanda of Bhāgavata, the mischievous deeds of Kṛṣṇa in his childhood are described in a lighter vein and the readers find in them a delightful humour.

वत्सान् मुञ्चन् क्वचिदसमये क्रोश सज्ञात हासः
स्तेयन् स्वाद्वत्यथ दधि पयः कल्पितैः स्तेय योग्यैः ।
मर्कान् भोक्ष्यन् विभजति स चेन्नात्ति भाण्डं भिनत्ति
द्रव्यालाभे स गृह कुपितो यात्युपक्रोश्य तोकान् ॥ [22]

At the time of Rukmiṇi's elopement with Kṛṣṇa, kings like Jarāsandha try in vain to attack him. After realizing their ability, they withdraw their efforts and decide to go back. But, Śiśupāla, the unfortunate bridegroom is bent on attacking Kṛṣṇa. Then Jarāsandha and other friends, advise Śiśupāla that health is wealth. Read the following verse -

भो भो पुरुष शार्दूल दौर्मनस्यमिदं विदुः।
न प्रियाप्रिययो राजन् निष्ठा देहिषु दृश्यते ॥
यदा दारुमयी योषित् नृत्यते कुहकेच्छया ।
एव मीश्वर तन्त्रोऽयमीहते सुखदुःखयोः ॥ [23]

As is seen in the verse, there is nothing wrong in the advice. But the context, is ill suited for Philosophy, particularly when it is used as a cover to hide one's inefficiency. Therefore, the disparity between the thought and context creates *Hāsya*. In continuation to this the

context when Kṛṣṇa cuts the hair and moustache of Rukmi, his brother-in-law, also draws humour.

THE PLACE OF HĀSYA IN SANSKRIT DRAMA

It is not at all surprising if we say that, in classical Sanskrit Literature, the origin of *Śravya* and *Dṛśya* Literatures is based on Pathetic and comic elements respectively. The Rāmāyaṇa is the outburst of the sorrowful heart of Vālmīki[24] and *Prahasana* Literature is the treasure of comic. It is already proved by critics that either of the *Bhāṇa* and *Prahasana* is the first form of Sanskrit Drama.

Even if we accept that *Bhāṇa* is the first to take its origin in the chronology of Sanskrit Drama, it all contains a lot of comic elements. Though *Bhāṇa* is *Śṛngāra* oriented - most of the *Bhāṇas* are designed with prostitutes, paramours and the illegal contracts and contacts of the ladies with many men. Such a type of *Śṛngāra* is nothing but *Rasābhāsa* which results in the Comic. Abhinavagupta commenting on the statement of Bharata i.e., शृङ्गारानुकृति र्यातु स हास्यस्तु प्रकीर्तितः explains the word *Anukṛti* as *Ābhāsa*[25] giving an example as--

दूरा कर्षण मोह मन्त्र इव मे तन्नाम्नि याते श्रुति
चेतः कालकला मपि प्रसहते नावस्थिति तां विना ।
एतैराकुलितस्य विक्षतरतेरङ्गै रनङ्गातुरैः
सम्पद्येत कथं तदाप्नि सुख मित्येत न्न वेद्मि स्फुटम् ॥ [26]

Here, the strong passion of Rāvaṇa for Sīta is described. We know that it is improper and against *Dharma*. So, the love of Rāvaṇa for Sīta claims only a secondary place which should be called *Rasābhāsa*. As per the famous critics like Abhinavagupta, Singabhūpāla etc, not only *Śṛngāra* but all the other sentiments rightly result in *Rasābhāsa* and provoke laughter if they are false and improper. All the *Prahasanas*, the *Prahasanas* of ancient times in particular, deal with the *Hāsya* brought out of the impropriety of other *Rasas*, especially of *Śṛngāra* and therefore it may not be

improper to suggest that the *Dṛśya* literature in Sanskrit may have its roots in *Hāsya*.

Moreover, *Bhāṇa* and *Prahasana* come under the categories like Satire, Farce etc, which are the types of comedy. They on the one hand, censure the improprieties and short comings of the society and on the other they try to rectify them and reform the society. That is their goal which should be attained through the path of the comic. Thus, we can conclude that the *Śravya* Literature has come into existence with the sentiment *Karuṇa* and then modified with *vīra* and *Śṛngāra* whereas *Dṛśya* literature has started with *Hāsya* and reorganised with *Vīra* and *Śṛngāra.*

Another point to remember is that according to Indian mythology, Vighneśwara is given the first place of worship in all rituals and he is the tutelary deity of the *Hāsya*. This also may be taken into account in calculating the importance of the *Hāsya*.

In Sanskrit literature, dramas are the main supporters of the *Hāsya*. They bear the entire responsibility more than any other type of literature in Sanskrit, in nourishing the *Hāsya*. Lord Brahman, according to Bharata, aimed at the satisfaction and the entertainment of deities, at the time of the creation of *Nāṭya*. So, he had to take into account all the types of sentiments in order to satisfy all types of spectators. So invariably *Nāṭya* had to involve the *Hāsya* also, but fortunately dramatic literature cheerfully accepted the responsibility and had become vital to *Hāsya*. *Śravya* literature of classical Sanskrit did a little help to the nourishment of *Hāsya*.

The freedom of the character in drama and the poet in a poem is similar. It is known that impropriety incongruity etc, are the basic elements of *Hāsya*. Hence the disorder or the impropriety of anything seems always connected with a character or the sequence of things, which most probably, would be proper to that particular character or the context. But in the case of *Śravya Kāvya*, the poet claims the major part. The nobility and gentleness should be maintained on his own part as well as on the part of his characters. It means that the

role of the poet is more important than the role of the characters in *Śravya Kāvya*. Thus, a dramatist could have more scope than a poet of *Śravya Kāvya* to give proper role to the *Hāsya*.

One more thing to be considered is that the drama mainly intended to be enacted. It should be presented or enacted in one and the same sitting without any gap of time. The spectator has to sit through out the play to know its ending. If it is a *Śravya Kāvya*, the reader may read it according to his will and pleasure and patience, in one sitting or in many a sitting. Meanwhile he recovers himself from the tension, and once again prepares himself to pursue the poem. Thus, the dramatist has to engage the spectator from A to Z and keep him out of boredom and vexation. When the play becomes too serious and conflict torn, the spectator has to be provided a lighter diversion, some humour to relieve himself of the tension. Even the foreign critics opine the same. To quote Cuddon..... "comic episodes or interludes usually in tragedy are aimed to relieve the tension and lighten the tragic element by contrast. They are or should be an essential and integral part of the whole work." [27]

This is the main and unique reason for offering such an importance to *Hāsya* in dramas.

After entering the dramatic universe *Hāsya* itself has established and held different positions in Sanskrit dramas i.e., as a main sentiment as some, as a sub-ordinate in some other and indirectly as *Rasābhāsa* in one or two. the following list gives the details.

Type of the drama	Main Sentiments	Sub-ordinating sentiments
Nāṭaka	*Sṛngāra, Vīra*	rest of the sentiments, mainly *Hāsya*
Prakaraṇa	*Sṛngara*	"
Samavākāra	*Vīra*	rest of the sentiments
Īhāmṛga	*Sṛngāra*	*Sṛngārābhāsa*
Ḍima	*Vīra, Bhayānaka*	*Hāsya* prohibited

Vyāyōga	"	"
Anka	*Karuṇa*	-
Prahasana	*Hāsya*	-
Bhāṇa	*Sṛngāra, Vīra* suggested only	*Hāsya, Adbhuta* etc.
Vīthi	All the sentiments with equal importance	-

We know that *Hāsya* is against the *vīra* and the *Bhayānaka*. Yet we can involve the *Hāsya* with *vīra* and *Bhayānaka* following the procedure of वैयधिकरण्य i.e., nourishing both from different premises or अवस्थान्तरित i.e., inserting any other neutral sentiment such as *Adbhuta* between them. The *Hāsya* is completely prohibited in the *Ḍima* and the *Vyāyōga*[28] in which the Vīra and the Bhayānaka are the main sentiments. These two oppose the comic totally and therefore the critics have prohibited the Hāsya in Ḍima and Vyāyōga. Though, in the Anka it is not forbidden,[29] it will be improper to offer the Hāsya because of the sorrowful nature of *Aṅka* with lamentations and mournings of ladies [30]

In *Vīthi* all the nine sentiments are granted equal importance. But in practice it is mainly carrying out either the *Sṛngāra* or *Sṛngārābhāsa* which perfectly calls for the spectators to be entertained with *Hāsya*. So, though the *Hāsya* is not solemnly connected with the *Vīthi* by critics all the playwrights of *Vīthi* have achieved the *Hāsya* well in practice.

There are three more types of Drama in which *Hāsya* stands subordinate namely *Nāṭaka*. *Prakaraṇa* and *Samavākāra*. Among these three, *Vīra* is supposed to be carried out and all the rest are offered equal importance in *Samavākāra*. Hence *Hāsya* may demand for significance as one of the eight. But by the side of the *Vīra*, it should not claim much value. Next, we have to really appreciate the *Nāṭaka*

and the *Prakaraṇa* which are the erotic-oriented chiefly, for their abundant contribution to the *Hāsya*. In these two, *Hāsya* comes next to *Śṛngāra* or *Vīra* because *Hāsya* has taken its origin from the *Śṛngāra*. Last but not the least, it is approvable that the affinity between these two should be developed more than any other pair of sentiments. If the society has any touch of *Hāsya* in Sanskrit Literature today it is due to the *Hāsya* developed in *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* only. [31]

Īhāmṛga thought not carrying out the comic directly, is achieving the comic indirectly in the name of *Śṛngārābhāsa*. Similarly, the *Bhānas* are also filled with *Hāsya*.

THE COMIC CHARACTERS IN SANSRKIT DRAMA

In Sanskrit Drama, we see some stereo-typed characters intended only to evolve *Hāsya*. Three of the assistants to the hero namely *Vidūṣaka, Viṭa* and *Ceṭa* according to the rhetoricians are humourous and always provoke laughter. *Vidūṣaka* plays the main role in carrying out the *Hāsya*. He is defined as हास्य प्रायो विदूषकः by the critics. *Viṭa* and *Ceṭa* are not defined as particularly connected with the comic. But *Viṭa* appears as a comedian in a number of dramas. *Ceṭa* is a character of a low-type. But there are a few dramatists such as Śūdraka (in Mṛcchakaṭika), Śrīharṣa (in Nāgānaḍa) etc., who utilised the character, *Ceṭa* to bring out laughter. But most of the dramatists kept him aloof as an attendant. However, on the whole, it is clear that *Vidūṣaka* is a promising character fully to evoke the comic, *Viṭa* is a character to the same duty but lees than *Vidūṣaka* and *Ceṭa* takes the least part of the comic. In *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa*, *Vidūṣaka* is the only recognised stereotyped comedian.

Comic relief is the main purpose of *Vidūṣaka*.[32] In Sanskrit, both in tragedies and comedies, *Vidūṣaka* appears very interestingly taking charge of his duties. *Vidūṣaka* demands our attention in Kundamāla, Tāpasavatsarāja etc., dramas though the plays are

pathetic. But Bhāsa in Pratimā and Pratijna Yaugandharāyaṇa and Bhavabhūti in Uttararāmacarita have not allowed *Vidūṣaka*. Maitreya in Mṛcchakaṭika, Vasantaka in Svapnavāsavadatta and Māḍhavya in Abhijnāna Śākuntala co-operate well to offer the comic relief. Vasantaka in Tāpasavatsarāja and Māṇavaka in Mālavikāgnimitra bear more responsibility. In most of the Sanskrit dramas, we see *Vidūṣaka* in the beginning of the second act, acting to a soliloquy. This is mainly to give some comic relief to the spectators.

Singabhūpāla has defined *Vidūṣaka* as विकृताङ्गवयो वेषैः हास्यकारी विदूषकः.[33] But Bharata defines Vidūṣaka as follows: -

वामनो दत्तुरः कुब्जो द्विजिह्वो विकृताननः ।
खल्वाटः पिङ्गलाक्षश्च स विधेयो विदूषकः ॥ [34]

Abhinavagupta supports this view. *Vidūṣaka* must possess an unnatural and disordered physical appearance as well psychological idiosyncrasies such as gluttony, timidity, quarrelling with the attendants - especially with ladies, interest on *Mōdakas*, inability to maintain secrecy, foolishness etc.. Some of these qualities however are exempted by certain dramatists showing sympathy for *Vidūṣaka*. For instance, Santuṣṭa in Avimāraka is not fond of food, Vasantaka in Tāpasavatsarāja is able to maintain secrecy and Māṇavaka in Mālavikāgnimitra is not at all a fool, and on the other hand he seems as clever as the hero. Abhinavagupta twice stated him as a man causing mirth to the heroine mainly. Bharata has pointed out the prominence of *Vidūṣaka* at the beginning of a drama being staged, and allotted one of the three places in '*Trigata*' for him. Nāṭya Sāstra and Nāṭyadarpaṇa classified *Vidūṣaka* into four kinds as Lingi, Diwija, Rājajīvi and Śiṣhya. [35]

Kaumudagandha in Śārīputra Prakaraṇa stands first in the chronology of *Vidūṣakas*. Next to him Santuṣṭa in Avimāraka, Vasantaka in Pratijnāyaugandharāyaṇa and Svapna Vāsavadatta and Maitreya in Ṣārudatta - all are the plays of Bhāsa - appear with full

equipment. A verse in Avimāraka said by Avimāraka about Santuṣṭa explaining his personality is really wonderful. Later playwrights - it seems - have forgotten this. Read this -

गोष्ठीषु हास्य स्समरेषु योधः
शोके गुरु स्साहसिकः परेषु ।
महोत्सवो मे हृदि किं प्रलापैः
द्विधा विभक्तं खलु में शरीरम् ।[36]

Though Bhāsa did not attribute all these qualities to Santuṣṭa, the entire personality of his *Vidūṣakas* by name Vasantaka and Maitreya added to Santuṣṭa, is qualifying him to this appreciation. But the successors of Bhāsa except Kālidāsa and Śūdraka have limited Vidūṣakas role only to *Hāsya*. Moreover, in some of the later dramas Vidūṣaka is not at all connected with the main plot of the drama.

The timely words of Santuṣṭa in *Avimāraka* when he was talking to Nalinikā, a servant-maid, and to the heroine the usage of malapropism in pronunciation and sarcastic statements by Maitreya in Ṣārudatta etc., are very interesting and delightful.

VIṬA AND ÇEṬA :-

काम तन्त्र कला वेदी विट इत्यभिधीयते ।
सन्धान कुशल श्चेटः कलहंसादिको मतः ॥[36a]

It is *Viṭa* who is an adept in the art of managing love as well as lust. *Dhananjaya* explains him as एक विद्यो विटः । But, in practice we find him appearing with in his efficiency in *Śṛngāra* shuffled with *Hāsya* and therefore he is made the hero of the *Bhāṇa*.[37] In other types of drama though he is efficient in managing love and lust he could not claim proper place at all. In *Dhūrta Viṭa Samvāda*, a *Bhāṇa* of Īśvaradatta many a theory of love and lust with distinct and deliberate phenomena of treatment creates a university of the speculated erotic theories.

It is my duty to illustrate some dramas in which the dramatists have utilised the character *Viṭa* to evolve the comic well. In the third

act of Nāgānanda, *Viṭa* enters the stage with his attendant *Ceṭa* as a drunkard and mistakes *Vidūṣaka* to Nalinika and tries to conciliate him by giving him Pan, half chewed, and after knowing the fact seeks his excuse.

All this seems a farce for refreshment to the audience. In the same manner, *Viṭa's* entrance with *Śakāra* and *Ceṭa* chasing Vasantasena, a prostitute, and his logical statements, misleading *Śakāra* to co-operate Vasantasena to escape from him, are very enjoyable in Mṛcchakaṭika. When *Śakāra* foolishly and brutally beats the monks and when he wants to kill his own attendant, *Viṭa* plays a vital role and saves them though the scene is farcical. Coming to *Ceṭa*, he is a specialist and recognised embodiment of uniting ladies and gents without any risk. But his impression on the audience will be meagre.

One more enlivening and attractive character in some Sanskrit dramas is of *Śakāra* whose complete form is seen in *Mṛcchakaṭika*. As a matter of fact, according to Bharata, *Śakāra* is one of the associates of the hero.

शकाराभीर चण्डाल पुलिन्दाः शबरास्तथा ।
हालिका भैरवा श्चेति सप्त वैभाषिकाः स्मृताः । [38]

Viśwanātha in Sāhityadarpaṇa clarified and confirmed his existence with an explanation of his personality as

मद मूर्खताभिमानी दुष्कुलतैश्वर्यसंयुक्तः ।
सोऽयमनूढा भ्राता राज्ञः श्याल श्शकार इत्युक्तः ॥ [39]

There are some devices adopted by *Śakāra* by which he often derives laughter.

अपार्थमक्रमं व्यर्थं पुनरुक्तं हतोपमम् ।
लोकन्याय विरुद्धं च शकारवचनं विदुः ॥ [40]

अपार्थम्-अक्रमम्-व्यर्थम्-पुनरुक्तम्-हतोपमम्-लोकविरुद्धम् and न्यायविरुद्धम् are his basic elements to evoke the comic. Let us be entertained by one or two of

these. *Punarukta* is called tautology. In noble poetry it is a blemish of sense, whereas in creating the comic it is a noble instrument. किं यासि धावसि प्रधावसि प्रस्खलन्ती and कूज कन्द लपवार्तं महेश्वरं शङ्करमीश्वरं वा etc., are the fascinating fragments of the tautological comic.

किं वासुदेवः शवपत्तनेशः कुन्तीसुतो वा जनमेजयो वा ।
अहं त्वां गृहीत्वा केशहस्ते दुशशासनः सीतामिवापहरामि ॥ [41]

etc., is sheer nonsense causing delightful laughter.

भाव शृणोमि गन्धं श्रवणाभ्याम् । अन्धकार पूरिताभ्यां
नासापुटाभ्यां सुष्ठु न पश्यामि । [42]

etc, are again cheerful with refreshing comic.

The heroines are also assisted by some characters like Sakhi etc.. in their erotic events. They are quoted by *Singabhūpāla*.

आसां दूत्यः सखी चेटी लिङ्गिनी प्रतिवेशिनी ।
धात्रेयी शिल्पकारी च कुमारी कथिनी तथा ॥
कारुः विप्रश्निका श्चति नेतृमित्रगुणान्विताः ॥ [43]

Among these ten characters, except *Sakhi* and *Ceṭi* all the rest are not capable of provoking the comic by nature. The assistants of the heroine and the comic aroused by them are not as gentle as required. Only the nature of *Sakhi* is enthusiastic and amusing. Priyamvadā in Abhijnāna Śakuntala is the best and noble example for the character of *Sakhi*, whereas Vakulāvalikā in Mālavikāgnimitra and Chandralekha in Kuvalayāvalį are the best among the *Ceṭis*.

The comic, provoked by these two is brighter than the comic of *Śakāra*. Priyamvadā demands appreciation from us with her high spirits in praising the beauty of Śakuntala and in encouraging her to respond to the love of Duṣyanta. The splendour of her humour enlightens the play as well as her character. Every word of her's delights the spectators. Her sayings are both reasonable and reliable. Thus, the character of Priyamvadā is shaped by Kālidāsa as an model character of *Ceti*. Her behaviour does not give scope to any

exaggeration in her words and movements. On the other hand, there is a humorous twist in her words. That is her efficiency to engrave the sculpture of the comic very attractively. Chandralekhā in Kuvalayāvali is the only *Sakhi* that can compete with Priyamvadā. In other words, both are from the same crucible but coloured differently.

Besides these, there are some sparks of the comic characters purely religious such as Nārada, Kṣapaṇaka, a model character in Buddhism and some disciples of certain teachers.

COMPONENTS OF DRAMATURGY:

Some of the components of the dramaturgy are giving scope to the *Hāsya* though they are not involved in the constituent of the *Hāsya* especially. They, standing within their own premises, are coming forth to take the responsibility of provoking laughter. Most of them come under the category of *Hāsya* based on the word.

There are five dramatic joints (*Sandhis*) with their (*Añgas*) parts. '*Narma*' a part of the *Pratimukha Sandhi* which is defined as परिहासवचो नर्म [44] and *Viçalana* a part of the *Avamarśa Sandhi* defined as विकत्थना विचलनम् [45] are giving an ample scope for the Hāsya.

In *Vāgārambha, Ālāpa* defined as चाटुप्रियोक्तिरालाप:[46], Sallāpa explained as उक्ति प्रत्युक्ति मद्वाक्यम्[47], *Pralāpa* which is stated as व्यर्थालापः प्रलापस्स्यात्[48], *Anulāpa*, defined as अनुलापो मृदुर्वचः [49] and *Apalāpa* which is explained as अपलापस्तु पूर्वोक्तस्यान्यथा योजनं भवेत् ।[50] are also capable of provoking the comic.

In *Buddhyārambhas*, *Kaiśikī* of which '*Narma*' is a division with subdivisions as *Śṛngāra Hāsya, Śuddha Hāsya*, and *Bhayānaka Hāsya*, each of which is once again sub divided as '*Vākyagata*' '*Çeṣṭāgata*' etc, totally with its eighteen divisions, co-operates to evoke the *Hāsya*. As a result of it, Singabhūpāla denies the theory of Udbhata who accepts the presence of *Kaiśikī* in the Pathos also.[51]

More to add, the parts of the *Vīthī* namely नालिका, असत्प्रलाप, प्रपञ्च, छल, त्रिगत and व्याहार and the parts of the *Prahasanas* such as अवलगित. अवस्यन्दित, व्यवहार, विप्रलम्भ, उपपत्ति, भय, अनृत, विभ्रान्ति and गद्गदवाक are purely comical. Though restricted to the *Vīthī* and *Prahasana*, these are appearing in the other types of dramas also but rarely in *Śravya Kāvyas*. This indicates their importance in the *Vithi* and the *Prahasana* only. It does not mean that they should be avoided in the other types. That is why Singabhūpāla gives examples for some of them from 'Prabodha Chandrodaya', a drama of Krishna Misra. Thus, the critics, giving importance to so many parts of the dramas, have proved that they have not neglected *Hāsya*.

There are so many medium and low type characters enlivening the *Hāsya* in *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa*. 'Prabodha Chandrodaya' of Krishnamisra. 'Samkalpa suryodaya' of Vedanta Desika etc., are symbolic and the characters in them are extremely cheerful. Especially in Prabodha Chandrodaya all the human feelings are personified and that is the main reason for its matchless level of enriching the *Hāsya*. All the names of the characters are the names of certain feelings and moods. The relationship between every two characters is applaudable. The other notable thing is the formation of particular families with those feelings and moods depending upon their personality and gender of the words. Such a comic is really flexible. The hyperboles of some of the characters are amazing and delightful. For instance, please read the conversation between Dambha and Ahamkāra.[52]

दम्भ:- बह्मन्! यद्यप्येवं तथाप्यस्माक मविदित वृत्तान्तो भवान्। तथाहि...

सदनमुपगतोऽहं पूर्वमम्भोजयोनेः
सपदि मुनिभिरुच्चैरासनेषूज्झितेषु।
सशपथमुपनीय ब्रह्मणा गोमयाम्भः
परिमृजित निजोरावाशु संयोजितोऽस्मि॥

अहङ्कारः- (स्वगतम्) अहो! दाम्भिकस्य ब्राह्मणस्य अत्युक्तिः । (विचिन्त्य) अथवा दम्भोऽयम् । भवत्वेवं तावत् । (प्रकाशम्) किमेवं गर्वयसे (सक्रोधम्)

अरे क इव वासवो कथय कोऽत्र पद्मोद्भवो
वद प्रभव भूमयो जगति का मुनीनामपि ।
अवेहि तपसो बलं मम पुरन्दराणां शतं
शतञ्च परमेष्ठिनां पततु वा मुनीना मपि ॥

These exaggerations and the false logics of the same quality, sparklingly come forth for the merriment of the spectators. Though *Śānta* is the main sentiment in this, *Hāsya* claims its place because, the Philosophical theories and thoughts are not demonstrated with the dry logic but with amusing *Hāsya*.

Both the *Nāṭaka* and *Prakarṇa* hold the responsibility of nourishing the *Hāsya* encouragingly which seems very pure, simple and flexible. Let us see one or two examples.

In Uttararāmaçarita an interlocution between Lakshmana and Sita is simply humourous. Such a type of *Hāsya* is very familiar to almost all the Indian people. Lakshmana was showing the painting of the biography of Rama and company to Rama and Sita. See a dialogue then-

लक्ष्मणः :- इयमार्या, इयमप्यार्या माण्डवी, इथमपि वधूः श्रुतकीर्तिः

सीता :- इयमप्यपरा का ?

लक्ष्मण :- (सलज्जस्मितं स्वगतम्) अये ऊर्मिलां पृच्छत्यार्था । भवत्वग्रतः प्रसारयामि । (प्रकाशम्) अये दृश्यतां बहु द्रष्टव्यम् । अयमितो भगवान भार्गवः [53]

Scenes like this are very familiar in social life. In Mālavikāgnimitra we see the cheerful comic based on running of the plot due to the intelligence of *Vidūṣaka*, who directly and indirectly, causes pure laughter. His brain appears better than his body and therefore the *Hāsya* in Mālavikāgnimitra is connected to the running of the plot only. As a result of his brain, a quarrel between the two

dance masters, namely Haradatta and Ganadāsa, comes into action and causes the mirth. Even the queen had to appreciate *Vidūṣaka* for his skill but through the king. Read this:

यदि राजकार्येषु ईदृशी निपुणता ततः शोभनं भवेत्। [54]

Thus, the Sanskrit scholars both the poets and the critics from the very beginning of the Sanskrit literature had contributed a lot to develop the sense of humour in the readers of Sanskrit literature and to promote the standards of the nourishment of the *Hāsya*, which influences everybody to be aware of the history - the social history and the religious history. Especially we are indebted to the Sanskrit dramatists for their unique contribution in this regard. The study of the Prahasana literature with theory and Practice will help us more in bringing out the facts about the position of *Hāsya* in Sanskrit literature.

FOOT-NOTES

CHAPTER - III

1)	Naatya Saastra		1-17
2)	For more details see "र या नाथर्वणा दवि" an essay in Rsikalpanyaasa' of Bharati Parishad, Prayaga Sahitya Section		P 54
3)	Rgveda		10-34-5
4)	Vedic Reader		P 189
5)	Rgveda		10-34-3
6)	Vedic Reader		P 188
7)	Rgveda		10-34-13
8)	Srimad Vaalmiki Raamaayana – Baalakaanda		49
9)	Ibid	Ayoodhyaakaanda	2/24, 25
10)	Ibid	"	33/35
11)	Ibid	"	33/41
12)	Ibid	Sundarakaanda	10/54
13)	Ibid	"	61/17
14)	Ibid	"	1/44
15)	Ibid	Yuddhakaanda	60/17
16)	Sri Mahaabhaaata Sabhaparva		1/3 to 5
17)	एकत्रैवानुरागः -		
18)	Sri Mahaabhaarata	Virataparva	21/4
19)	Ibid	"	21/46
20)	Ibid	"	35/18
21)	Srimadbhaagavata		4-5-14,15
22)	Ibid		10-8-30
23)	Ibid		10-54-11, 12

24) काव्यस्यात्मा स एवार्थस्तथा चादि कवेः पुरा ।
क्रोच्च द्वन्द्व वियोगोत्थः शोकः श्लोक त्वमागतः ॥ Dhvanyaaloka 1-5

25) अनुकृति रमुख्यता आभास इतिह्य कोऽर्थः । Locana P 179

26) Abhinavabhaarati vol. I P. 295

27) A dictionary of Literary Terms P 137, 138

28) रसैरहास्य शृङ्गारैः षड्भिः दीप्तै स्समन्वितः । Dasarupaka 3/58

29) दीप्ताः स्युः डिमवद्रसाः

30) रसस्तु करुण स्थायी
युक्तःस्त्री परिदेवितैः Ibid 3/71

31) श्रृङ्गाराभासमप्यस्य किञ्चित्किञ्चित्प्रयोजयेत् । Ibid 3/74

32) विश्रामे गीत पाठयादेः सदस्यानां नटादिभिः ।
परिहासाय योक्तव्याः देश भाषाभिरन्विताः ॥ Naatyasaastra 10/290

33) Rasaarnavasudhaakara 1/92

34) Naatyasaastra 24/19,20

35) स्निग्धा धीरोद्धतादीनां यथौचित्यं वियोगिनाम् ।
लिङ्गी द्विजो राजजीवी शिष्याश्चति विदूषका. ॥ Naatyadarpana P 178

36) Avimaraka Act IV v 21

36)a Rasaarnava Sudhaakara 1-91

37) भाणस्तु धूर्त चरितं स्वानुभूतं परेण वा ।
यत्रोपवर्णये देको निपुणः पण्डितो विटः ॥ Dasarupaka 3/49

38) Naatyasaastra 10-289

39) Sahityadarpana 3-44

40) Quoted in notes on Mruchakatika P9
by Kasinatha Panduranga

41) Mrcchakatika 1-12

42) “

43) Rasaarnava Sudhakara 1/160, 161

44) Rasaarnava Sudhaakara 1-33

45) Ibid 1 48

46) Ibid 1-222

47) Ibid 1-222

48) Ibid 1-223

49) Ibid 1-223

50) Ibid 2-231

51) श्रृङ्गार हास्य करुण रसातिशयसिद्धये ।
एषा `वृत्तिः प्रयत्नेन प्रयोज्या रसकोविदैः ॥
विचार सुन्दरो नैष मार्गः स्यादित्युदास्महे ।
कैशिकी वृत्ति भेदानां नर्मादीनां प्रकल्पनम् ॥
यतः करुण माश्रित्य रसाभासत्व कारणम् ॥ Ibid 1/291

52) Prabodhachandrodaya

53) Uttararaamacarita

54) Maalavikaagnimitra P-95

PRAHASANA: THEORY

Generally, the *Prahasana* deals with the contemporary social conditions in an ironical and satirical manner, changing its form and nature from time to time. Though the form of the *Prahasana* is subjected to change and modified both internally and externally, the inherent quality i.e., the nature of comic evolution and the purpose of social reformation, is not lost sight of. The evolution of the Prahasana through ages is now noticed in its several stages of development.

The word *'Prahasana'* is dervied from the root '*Has*' with the prefix '*Pra*' and suffix '*Lyuṭ*' which means either the instrument or the *Prop*.[1]

Bharata, describes the nature of *Prahasana* known to him as a type of drama as follows:-

भगवत्तापसविप्रैरन्यैरपि हास्यवाद सम्बद्धम् ।
कापुरूष सम्प्रयुक्तं परिहासाभाषणप्रायम् ॥

अविकृतभाषाचारं विशेषभावोपपन्न चरित पदम् ।
नियतगति वस्तुविषयं शुद्ध ज्ञेयं प्रहसनन्तु ॥

वेश्या चेट नपुंसक विटधूर्ता बन्धकी च यत्र स्युः ।
अनिभृतवेष परिच्छद चेष्टितकरणैस्तु सङ्कीर्णम् ॥

लोकोपचारयुक्ता या वार्ता यश्च दम्भसंयोगः।
स प्रहसने प्रयोज्यो धूर्तप्रविवादसम्पन्नः ॥
वीथ्यङ्गैस्संयुक्तं कर्तव्यं प्रहसनं यथायोगम् ॥[2]

This description of Bharata include in it both the definition and classification of *Prahasana.* Later Dhananjaya, the author of Daśarūpaka follows the same way.

तद्वत्प्रहसनं त्रेधा शुद्धवैकृत सङ्करैः [3]

Here, the word '*Tadvat*' means '*Bhāṇavat*' as the *Bhāṇa* is defined immediately before the *Prahasana*.[4]

Nāṭyadarpaṇa is the first to define and classify the *Prahasana* separately. It says;

वैमुख्यकार्यं वीथ्यङ्गी ख्यात कौलीनदम्भवत् ।
हास्याङ्गि भाणसन्ध्यङ्क-वृत्ति प्रहसनं द्विधा ॥[5]

The above definition appears to be brief. So, it requires an elaborate explanation. According to Nāṭyadarpaṇa *Prahasana* consists of the irrelevant action or practice, the elements of Vīthi such as *Udghātyaka, Avalagita* etc., the famous but hypocritical characters, *Hāsya* as the main sentiment, the two *Sandhis* as *Mukha* and *Nirvahaṇa, Bhāratī Vṛtti* as in the case of *Bhāna* and only one act.

Śāradātanaya defines the *Prahasana* extensively. But like Bharata he also combines both definition and classification of *Prahasana* and next gives certain elements that are supposed to be in the *Prahasana*.[6] But Viswanatha defines and classifies Prahasana clearly.

भाणवत्सन्धिसन्ध्यङ्ग लास्याङ्गाङ्कैर्विनिर्मितम् ।
भवेत्प्रहसनं वृत्तं निन्द्यानां परिकल्पितम् ॥
अत्र नारभटी नापि विष्कम्भक प्रवेशकौ ।
ज्ञेयो हास्यरसस्तत्र वीथ्यङ्गानां स्थितिर्न वा ॥[7]

Prahasana has to involve in it the *Sandhi*, *Sandhyanga, Lāsyānga* and the number of acts, as in the case of *Bhaṇa*[8], but the theme of the *Prahasana* should be connected with the Vices. There should not be the *Ārabhatī* one of the four well known *Vṛttis* and *Viṣkambha* and *Praveśaka*, the two important features among the five अर्थोषक्षेपक, that are intended to indicate the restricted or undeserving scenes in a drama. Comic is the main sentiment and there may be the elements of *Vīthi.*

Singabhūpāla in his *Rasārṇavasudhākara* includes ten more features, which are part and parcel of the *Prahasana* by name *Prahasanāngas*, in addition to the above description. Read-

वस्तुसन्ध्यङ्ग लास्याङ्ग वृत्तयो यत्र भाणवत् ।
रसो हास्यः प्रधानः स्यादेतत्प्रहसनं स्मृतम् ॥
विशेषेण दशाङ्गानि कल्पयेदत्र तानि तु ॥[9]

अवलगितमवस्कन्दो व्यवहारो विप्रलम्भमुपपत्तिः ।
भयमनृतं विभ्रान्तिः गद्गदवाक् च प्रलापश्च ।[9a]

Singabhūpāla is the only critic to employ the *Prahasanāngas* in connection with the *Prahasana*.

The above definitions form a view of *Prahasana* without going into details. But I think it is necessary to deal with the subject in detail with proper analysis of the definition. Let us take up the same now omitting the *Nāndī, Prastāvanā* etc., as they are common to all types of dramas.

In general, the plot, the hero and the sentiment are the basic elements in the classification of Sanskrit drama[10]. They are dealt with here in the same order.

The Plot (*Vastu*) of any *Prahasana* will be the *Utpādya* i.e., created by the poet himself. In the creation of the plot, as Viswanatha says, the vices of the persons must be given predominant place, but their behaviour must be censured. A person will be censured if he is not devoted to duty and tries to evade the responsibility. These duties and responsibilities are of four kinds according to *Varna-aśrama-dharma* or *Puruṣārthas* based on individuality, environments and physical and psychological conditions.

There are five stages or conjunctions to unify the objects of the plot namely, *Mukha Sandhi, Pratimukha Sandhi, Garbha Sandhi. Avamarśa Sandhi* and *Upasamhṛti Sandhi.* But in a *Prahasana* only two of the five i.e., *Mukha Sandhi* and *Upasamhṛti Sandhi* are allowed. Having one or two acts the *Prahasana* is not spacious enough to involve a minute elaboration of the plot in it, and therefore just the above two conjunctions are allowed in the *Prahasana*.

There are some more sub-conjunctions to unify the objects of the plot namely, *Sandhyantaras*. Bharata has just mentioned their names and Singabhūpāla has mentioned and defined them in detail with illustrations. These *Sandhyantaras* are twenty-one in number[11], Abhinavagupta has stated one more *Sandhyantara* namely *Ćāpala* to invent the comic. Nothing is controversial in admitting *Ćāpala* as

a part of the comic. So, though it is not stated by dramaturgies, we can admit *Ćāpala* as a *Sandhyantara* in *Prahasana*.

Secondly, we have to deal with the hero of *Prahasana*. As in the case of the *Naṭaka,* the *Prakarṇa* etc., all the *Prahasanas* do not contain only one hero. Most of the *Prahasanas* especially the ancient Prahasanas like Laṭakamelaka, Hāsyārṇava Prahasana etc., have many heroes. The unity of action is also so much clear. Imitation of *Sṛngāra* is allowed in the *Prahasana*, but none of the *Sṛngāra Nāyikās*. Moreover, the dramaturgies wanted to bring up the plot with the biographies of the vices. It is known that the entire literature is intended to form a better society.

The *Prahasanas* are also intended to enlighten the value of the four *Puruṣārthas*. As said previously taking the characters who lack the genuity of the *Puruṣārthas*. The *Prahasana* writers had to accept only low-type characters as in the case of the Greek comedy, to achieve Catharsis.

Hāsya is the main sentiment with all its variations like *Smita*, *Hasita* etc., as admitted by the rhetoricians. As a matter of fact, all the sentiments as *Sṛngāra,* Vīra etc., are also capable to subserve *Hāsya,* but in the shape of *Ābhāsa*. Among the four human goals, *Artha* and *Kāma* united with Dharma attain *Mokṣa. Artha* and *Kāma* are the significances of *Vīra* and *Sṛngāra* respectively united with other sentiments. The down fallen stage of either Artha or *Kāma* is a matter of fun. So much so, the down fallen stage of *Sṛngāra* and *Vīra* united with other sentiments is also a matter of fun. So, all the other sentiments in the shape of *Ābhāsa* subserve the *Hāsya* in *Prahasana.* As the aim of the *Prahasana* is to promote the standards and practices of धर्मार्थ and धर्मकाम, the nourishment of the down fallen *Sṛngāra, Vīra* etc., is very necessary in *Prahasana*. As the study of *Hāsya* in *Prahasana* is to be dealt with later in detail, the second thing, is being taken up now.

Bharata did not say anything about the number of acts in the *Prahasana*. But the later critics have allowed only one act. The external structure is a matter of formation of the thought, i.e., the

internal structure of the plot. The way of forming the thought is divided as *Sandhis*. So, the number of acts of external formation must be as per the internal formation of the thought with the help of *Sandhis*.

But according to some critics as quoted by Abhinavagupta[12], *Suddha Prahasana* has only one act and the *Sankīrṇa* has one or more acts.

Bharata[13], Dhananjaya[14], Śāradātanaya[15] and Vidyānatha[16] are of the opinion that the *Prahasana*, mixed with *Vīthyangas* is *Sankīrṇa* or *Miśra*. But all *Vīthyangas*[17] cannot provoke the *Hāsya*. For Udghātyaka[18] and Avalagita[19], the first two are not comic oriented. But Prapañca[20], Trigata[21], Nālika[22], Asatpralāpa[23] and Vyāhāra[24] are very helpful to create comic.

There are also *Lāsyāngas* to be employed in *Prahasana* which are enumerated like this-

गेयपदं स्थितपाठ्य मासीनं पुष्पगण्डिका ।
प्रच्छेदक स्त्रिगूढश्च सैन्धवाख्यं द्विमूढकम् ॥
उत्तमोत्तमकञ्चान्यदुक्तिप्रत्युक्तमेव च ।
लास्ये दशविधं ह्येतदङ्गनिर्देश कल्पनम् ।[25]

As a matter of fact, all *Lāsyāngas* are not comic oriented. At times *Praccedaka*[26] and *Uktipratyukta*[27] may evoke the comic to some extent, but the rest of the *Lāsyāngas* do not fully fructify the *Prahasana* in encouraging the comic.

Singabhūpāla is correct in his way in attributing the *Prahasanāngas*. Despite their inconclusive devotion to *Prahasana* as Singabhūpāla himself gives examples for *Prahasanāngas* from Prabodha Candrodaya of Kṛṣṇamiśra, all of them are comic-oriented and therefore acceptable in the *Prahasanas*.

Bharata, saying as हास्य शृङ्गार बहुला कैशिकी परिचक्षिता। [28] has fastened the *Hāsya* with *Kaisikī*. Kohala has permitted specifically Bhārati also to be dependable to enrich *Hāsya*.

बीराद्भूत प्रहसनैरिह भारती स्यात्
सात्त्वत्यपीह गदिताद्भत बौर रौद्रैः ।
श्रृङ्गार हास्य करूणैरिह कैशिकी स्यात्
इष्टा भयानक युतारभटी च रौद्री ॥[29]

Critics, like Vidyānatha have given importance only to *Bhārati*. *Bhārati* is a style of speech whereas the *Kisikī* is a mode of action. Both are acceptable in the *Prahasana*, as the *Hāsya* mainly depends upon the movements and the style of the delivery of dialogues. Moreover, modern Radio dramas, Jokes etc., are mainly based on *Bhārati Vṛtti*. The above said is the law of the *Prahasana* developed by the critics. But in practice, the form of the *Prahasana* is changed from time to time by the dramatists. Such a change has taken place from the thirteenth century A. D. Vatsarāja in *Hāsya Ćūḍāmaṇi* fantastically deals with highly polished and ravishing comic. But that change appears to have been very simple. Since the sixteenth century A.D and more in the twentieth century the Prahasana has revised its format, influenced by contemporary literature in other languages. But almost all the critics are very particular in imitating Bharata. So, nothing is added to the definition of *Prahasana* given by Bharata till today. Moreover, the successors of Bharata have made the definition of the Prahasana confusing to some extent. Now let us look at the further developments of the definition of the Prahasana based on the practice of the Sanskrit Prahasanas. But I regret to say that modern Sanskrit rhetoricians were not interested in examining and implementing the changes as most of the Sanskrit criticism is prescriptive than descriptive.

In connection with the plot of the *Prahasana*, it is said that the plot should be related to detestable persons i.e., Nindyas. But it does not mean that every *Nindya* is a source for comic creation. For instance, let us take the case of a dacoit.

Though he deserves censure, for betraying society, his story does not cause *Hāsya*. But, if his behaviour shows, confusion or disorder we laugh at him. His censurability does not cause comic, but his

confused mentality does. So, censure is proved not to be taken in the ordinary sense, but it requires certain explanation. Hence censurability, means the behaviour of a person swerving righteousness and being criticised, but without degradation in his quality. Such behaviour invites the attention of the dramatist in order to evoke the comic. So, the despicability (*Nindyatā*) in the general sense is differed from the despicability at which we laugh. Indiscipline is the element of despicability naturally. But despicability, in the theme of a *Prahasana* is indelicate or improper. So, despicability in *Prahasana*, is a peculiar quality to be laughed at, not to be hated.

Abhinavagupta in Abhinavabhāratī has denied diversity in the theme of any *Prahasana*.[30] Fortunately the modern prahasana writers have deviated from the established opinions of Viśwanātha and Abhinavagupta and have paved a new path regarding the theme of the *Prahasana*. Hence, the characters in the modern *Prahasanas* are made to deviate from their duties of their caste or tribe by many ways. On the other hand, certain things not being censured are also subjected to evolve the *Hāsya* in the modern *Prahasanas.*

We are aware of the fact that standards of judgement change from time to time and from place to place. Both critics and play-wrights have realized this fact and reconsidered the views of their predecessors in the light of the changing standard- of the judgement.

The intention of ancient critics, compelling the dramatists to handle the theme of the persons deserving censure in *Prahasana*, is very extensive and it involves various types of faults in it which are not legal admonitions. For, the absentmindedness, funny behaviour, witty and humourous treatment of objects can also provoke the applaudable *Hāsya*. Even the wit, a small instrument to lit the candle of *Hāsya*, if used properly can play its role throughout the play. P.P. Mehta discussing the theory of the comedy of Gottsched says "For him the subject of comedy is petty and ridiculous, faults like absent minded mannerism etc., and comedy is confined to the middle class only".[31] Why not we allow such a subject in the *Prahasana*? Dramatists have rightly accepted such things and plots and have dealt with them in modern *Prahasanas*.

Let us take an absentminded professor as the hero of the *Prahasana*. He does not deserve blame, but his behaviour is laughable. There are many persons who forget their umbrellas, taking medicine, posting of letters etc., A number of modern Sanskrit playwrights like Jīvanyāya tīrtha etc., have made a good effort to write *Prahasanas* with noble but laughable themes. Therefore, it may be concluded that the opinions of the ancient critics are brought out only from one crucible, without paying any attention to further development of thought. Moreover, in modern *Prahasanas*, we see variation of plots adopting the highness of humanity and human tendency in the contemporary social conditions.

Critics on *Prahasana* have sufficient zeal to deal with the characters rather than the plot and its variety. Moreover, they have suggested many types of persons of low character to be dealt with in the *Prahasana*. The dramatists, in practice, might have attempted to take fresh plots with their individual genius if they are left free from the restrictions of the characters. Almost all the *Prahasana* writers of ancient times were not aware of creating new plots. Hence the brilliant imagination is suppressed. Thus, the individual genius has been overpowered by tradition and convention. Unfortunately, even to-day there are certain play-wrights who have not come out from the influence of the types of persons enlisted by ancient rhetoricians.

But it is the duty of the poet to study the society of his times and to adopt the inevitable changes as a genuine poet and it is the duty of a critic to study the contemporary literature at the time of defining things. Criticism could serve better if it is descriptive rather than prescriptive. But in the case of *Prahasana* the prescription of the definition and the faithful following of the definition caused a great loss.

The Brahmins who have disregarded their duties, ascetics, irregular followers of Buddhism, servants, servant maids, prostitutes, paramours, sages and the impotent are the main characters enlisted by critics to be conducive to the nourishment of comic in *Prahasana*. But in the modern *Prahasanas*, particularly in the *Prahasanas* of the twentieth

century most of these characters disappeared. Characters from the entire humanity and from the depths of their nature are brought up and projected on stage through *Prahasanas*.

One or two Acts are allowed in the *Prahasana*, according to the critics. But gradually in practice, the number of acts in the *Prahasana* is raised up to seven or even more. Ancient *Prahasana* like Hāsya Ćūḍāmaṇi, Laṭakamelaka, Hāsyārṇava Prahasana etc., are divided into two acts, whereas in modern *Prahasanas* like Līlāvilāsa Prahasana we see seven acts. The number of acts is neither constructive, nor destructive, being a linguistic structure of the thought developed effectively.

The spectators to the Prahasana: -

Abhinavagupta mentions only women, children, and stupids to be entertained by the *Prahasana*,[32] because he opines that the importance of the *Hāsya* and lack of diversity in the plot, degrades the *Prahasana* to some extent. In general, crookedness of the make-up and movements and perversion of speech and mood are the main elements to create the *Hāsya*. The *Hāsya* based on these elements except the perversion of speech may be understood only by women and children. But the element, the perversion of speech requires only scholars and sharp- minded persons. At times even a great scholar fails to understand and follow the evasive speech. Thus, the statement of Abhinavagupta is partly applicable. Perhaps Abhinavagupta might have seen the *Prahasana* of the predecessors and contemporaries, in which exaggerated acting, and thoughts were plenty and have admitted the opinion of Bharata[32] without any change. But gradually the *Prahasanas* have changed in their form and nature by involving wonderful and pleasant jokes with delightful perversions of speech. Therefore, they require not only women, children and fools, but intellectuals as well as sharp wits.

Burrow defines wit in connection with the intellectual as-

"Wit is proper and commendable when it enlightens the intellect by good sense conveyed in jocular expression".[33]

So, when the comic is based on the *Āhārya* and *Āñgika* which do not require much intelligence to be understood, there, the spectators of the play may be only women children, and stupids. But when the wit or the perfect humour plays the leading part, there, the spectators must and should be intellectuals. We are not sure of equality of the manners in the nourishment of the comic in every *Prahasana*. A fool who is entertained by one *Prahasana* may not be able to understand another. The same theory is applicable in the case of a scholar also.

Now we have to think over what forced Abhinavagupta to declare that women, children and stupids are the eligible spectators to a *Prahasana*. He might have gone to the result of the *Prahasana* i.e., the teaching of the *Puruṣārthas* (*Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa*). The main aim of *Prahasana* is to educate the society in order to work for the attainment of the human goals. Other than the *Prahasana* type of Sanskrit Drama work in favour of the educated persons to polish their knowledge of the human goals. So a particular type of drama is essential to educate the women, children and the dull. *Prahasana* fulfils the same. So, Abhinavagupta might have restricted the *Prahasana* for women, children and stupids.

In the 25th chapter of Nātyasāstra, *Bharata* deals with various kinds of acting and imitations. Explaining the actions of certain objects in connection with the comic, he signifies the importance of it.

He says -

प्रत्यङ्गहीनं यत्काव्यं विकृतञ्च प्रयुज्यते ।
न लक्षणकृतस्तत्र कार्यस्त्वभिनयो बुधैः ॥ [34]

Vikṛti is the main feature in evolving the *Hāsya*, which is the main sentiment in the *Prahasana*. So, whatever the action that contain *Vikṛti* should be given place in the *Prahasana*. We can define what a particular thing ought to be, but we are helpless in the case of ought nots as they flow by all means. So, it is not easy to define the perfect action in the *Prahasana*. Imperfection helps *Prahasana* than perfection. Realizing the very fact Bharata has rightly stated that there is no rule meant for the action in the *Prahasana*. We know that

even the illegal and unscientific and indelicate action also provokes *Hāsya*.

None of the Sanskrit critics has framed any rule either in favour or against the existence of verses in dramas, Just they have indicated that there might be verses in the prologue. But all Sanskrit dramas are shaped in both prose and verse. But in the case of the *Prahasana* it caused a great loss. Fascinating comic thrives well on humorous discourses, simple, trifle and cut-dialogues.

So, now-a-days, Sanskrit play-wrights being influenced and activated by the western aesthetics are ascertaining the importance of prose and paying much attention in writing the prose-oriented *Prahasanas* as also. However, they are assenting and ascribing the prologue, prelude and epilogue with verses but the rest of the play is left with prose only. Thus, the Sanskrit *Prahasana* is giving delight to the theatre-going people with many a kind of wit and humour involved in.

Place of Prahasana in the chronology of Sanskrit drama: -

Prahasana developed gradually from time to time with the treatment of the critics as well as the practice of the poets. Neither the doctrine of art nor the theories of science have got their developed form at a time. But Sanskrit critics as the describers of the ten types of drama followed the easiest method, by explaining the *Nāṭaka* at first as the *Prakṛti* and next the other types with their distinctive features as *Vikṛtis*. So, they have not spoken of the chronological development of Sanskrit drama.

Bharata mentioned and defined the ten types of Sanskrit dramas but didn't give any example. Though he spoke of *Tripuradāha Ḍima* and *Amṛtamathana Samavākāra* in connection with the mythological origin of Sanskrit Drama, which are not available now. So, we have to discuss logically and have to decide the place of the *Prahasana* in the origin and development of Sanskrit Drama.

According to K H. Dhru, the one-act plays are the oldest of all the ten types of Sanskrit drama. Our ancient seers and prophets after

completing their routine sacrificial duties have been interested to be entertained by the dramas. Most probably, then the time, being the evening twilight, there has been no scope of enacting any large plays. Thus, the habit of enacting the one-act plays has come into effect. Gradually with the emergence of the professional actors, the dramas might have been played in towns and cities enhancing the number of acts and actors. Some of the hymns in *Ṛgveda* like the *Soma* and the *Akṣa* are in support of the above theory. They seem, as if they are mono-actions and especially the hymn of *Akṣa*, which is not at all useful in any sacrificial activity. Therefore, according to K. H. Dhru, the *Bhāna*, the *Prahasana*, the *Vīthi*, the *Añka* and the *Vyāyoga* are the dramas of the primitive eastern theatre. But he kept silent in placing the five one-act plays in a chronological order.

Though, these five are equally placed according to the number of acts, the *Bhāna* stands first according to the number of characters and nature. Let us see in detail. Sañgītaratnākara of śārñgadeva says that *Bhāna* is the type of drama in which *Nṛtta* is the leading feature. In the chronological development of *Nṛtta*, *Nṛtya* and *Nāṭya*, *Nṛtta* stands first. Thus, *Nṛtta* the primary part of the drama, proves *Bhāna* as the primitive stage of Sanskrit drama. Moreover, the three unities propounded by Greek critics and the essential traits of the ancient Greek drama are also seen almost all the *Bhānas*, which are completely absent in later Sanskrit plays. So, this can also prove the primitive stage of the *Bhāna*. Moreover, the *Bhāṇa*, by its nature, is very closer to *Śravyakāvya. Vāçikābhinaya* is the main feature of the *Bhāna*. On the other hand, *Sātvikābhinaya* which is the life of a drama hardly appears in the *Bhāṇa*. So, the position of the *Bhāṇa* may be a medium stage between the poetry and drama. It is an audio vision programme. So, *Bhāṇa* may be the first of all the types of Sanskrit drama. From that the *Vīthi* and from the *Vīthi*, the *Prahasana* might have developed independently. The *Bhāṇa* has only one character, but the *Vīthi* may have one or two. The *Prahasana* has many characters in it. Hence *Prahasana* may be the third in the chronological development of the ten types of the Sanskrit drama. This theory is supported by Dr. M. M. Ghosh like the following.

The *Bhāṇa* is the first as it contains only one act and only one character. The *Vīthi* is the second as it contains only one act and one or two characters. The *Prahasana* is the third as it contains only one act and many characters. The *Vyāyoga* and the *Añka* also fall in the third stage. The *Samavākāra* is the fourth stage with many unconnected acts and my characters. The *Ḍima* and the *Īhāmṛga* belong to the fourth stage with four connected acts and many characters and the *Nāṭaka* and the *Prakarṇa* belong to the last stage with five or ten fully connected acts and many characters.

The source for the above specification of Dr. Ghosh is the number of characters and acts, with special reference to their mutual relation. But with a view relating to the nourishment of the sentiment also, the arrangement of Dr. Ghosh is apparent. The *Bhāṇa* with the distinct and improper eroticism proclaims its intimacy with social life and stands as the first of all the dramas. It is full of speeches not quite suitable for stage. But the *Vīthi* consists of either such speeches or discourses on the stage. The *Hāsya* is closely associated with the *Sṛngāra*. As a matter of fact, in most of the *Bhāṇas* the imitation of the *Sṛngāra* or the *Sṛngārābhāsa* is seen in a large part and therefore the *Sṛngāra* and *Hāsya* are fastened together. The same state of affair is seen in many *Prahasanas* of ancient times but the *Hāsya* becomes prominent instead of the *Srñgāra,* as in the case of the *Bhāṇas*, and the *Sṛngāra* strengthens the *Hāsya*, thus, uplifting the importance of the comic, the *Prahasana* comes next to the *Bhāṇa* and the *Vīthi*. And there is a minute difference too, between the *Bhāṇa* and the *Prahasana* which evidently attributes the first and the second places to the *Bhāṇa* and the *Vīthi* and the *Prahasana* respectively. In the ancient *Bhāṇas*, the male character is predominant, and the lady characters are most probably prostitutes. Thus, *Sṛñgārābhāsa* concealed at the primitive stage and later with proper importance to all the characters the *Prahasana* possessed the complete form of a drama. Therefore, we conclude that the *Prahasana* is next to the *Bhāṇa* and the *Vīthi*.

But Mr. Mankad brings the *Bhāṇa* and the *Prahasana* together and nearer than in the above theory without contradicting it. According to him, the *Bhāṇa* is the first having very little plot and

easy flowing style with minimum dramatic elements. After including the discourses along with the *Ākāśabhāṣita* etc., it had the form of the *Vīthi*. Then the *Prahasana* might have come out of the *Bhāna*, and the *Añka* out of the *Vīthi*. Thereafter, the *Vyāyoga*, the *Ḍimā*, the *Īhāmṛga*, the *Samavākāra*, the *Prakarṇa* and the *Nātaka* have taken their form. The exclusion of the *Vīthi* amidst the *Bhāṇa* and the *Prahasana* is seen in this theory. One can convert a *Bhāṇa* into a *Prahasana* easily, but it is not possible to convert a *Prahasana* into a *Bhāṇa*. It proves the primary stage of the *Bhāṇa* and the secondary stage of the *Prahasana*. Thanks to Mankad for contributing a theory to come to a fastidious conclusion.

But Dr. V. Raghavan estimates *Vīthi* as the first of all Sanskrit dramas. For him, *Vīthi* at the primitive stage of the dramatic literature has come into practice to satirize different customs, habits, mentalities, behaviours and other peculiar tendencies of different personalities of the society. At first it was a one-act play. The *Bhāṇa* is derived from the *Vīthi* with one act, and the *Prahasana* has come out from the *Vīthi* with two acts. Step by step they have become part and parcel of *Nāṭaka*.[35] The chronological development of the above three has made a path to invite the *Prakaraṇa*. Afterwards, the heroic plays the *Samavākāra*, the *Īhāmṛga*, the *Vyāyoga* and the *Ḍima* have been developed followed by the *Añka*. No doubt, this is the theory so polished but at the very beginning stage of this theory itself, we have to split the *Vīthi* into two.

In fact, there is very little difference between the *Vīthi* and the *Bhāṇa* except in the number of characters allowed. So, at all instances, all the *Bhāṇas* irrespective of the number of the characters allowed, are one character oriented. Thus, the *Bhāṇa* claims the first place followed by the *Vīthi*, and the *Prahasana* the second in the chronology of Sanskrit drama.

Gradually, almost all the one act plays had to subserve the major plays like *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* etc. As it is necessary to lighten the seriousness of the plot in the *Nāṭaka* and the *Prakaraṇa*, the *Prahasanas* have to devote to the major plays. Dr. V. Raghavan believes that the *Bhāṇa* and the *Prahasana* have taken their form

from the *Vīthi* and unfortunately the *Vīthi* lost its identity, but the *Bhāṇa* and *Prahasana* have become part and parcel of the *Naṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa*. Thats why Abhinavagupta while commenting on the word दशरूप विकल्पनं नाटकम् of Bharata, opines that according to the compound Bahuvrīhi the word means only *Nāṭaka*, in which all the ten types of Sanskrit dramas are included.[36]

Classification of Prahasana:-

None of the ten types of Sanskrit Drama is sub-divided by any critic except the *Prahasana*. But the *Bhāṇa* has its own division, like *Sāmānya* and *Miśra*, though not done by critics. Kasipati of 18th century A.D., in his Mukundānanda Bhāṇa named his work as *Miśra Bhāṇa*, but did not define it. Occasionally Lingamagunta Ramakavi in Sṛñgārarasodaya bhāṇa has indicated the nature of the division of the *Bhāṇa* as follows -

सुकविर्बभाण भाणं
शृङ्गाररसोदयाख्य मन्वर्थम् ।
भाषाद्वय भूषितमति
गुणतोषित मवशेषितोक्तिभिस्सहितम् ॥[37]

By this we may ascertain that the existence of particular languages like *Sanskrit* and *Prakrit* led the latest poets to classify the *Bhāṇa*. But this could not stand as a guideline to classify all the ten types of Sanskrit Drama, because many of the remaining types of *Rūpaka* like *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* consist of many characters including the lowest type and therefore Prakrit is essential. In *Bhāṇa*, *Viṭa* the only low-type character appears on stage and that has minimised the freedom of the poets of ancient times to use Prakrit only. But later poets, irrespective of the character on stage have made it common to use Sanskrit also which has resulted in the classification of *Bhāṇa.* Now let us see the division of the Prahasana in detail.

Bharata, the earliest among the Sanskrit critics has classified the *Prahasana* as *Suddha* and *Sañkīrṇa* and has defined them as follows-

भगवत्तापस भिक्षुशोत्रिय विप्रातिहास संयुक्तम् ।
नीच जन सम्प्रयुक्तं परिहासाभाषण प्रायम् ॥
अविकृत भाषा चारं विशेषहासोपरचितपदम् ।
नियतिगतिवस्तुविषयं शुद्ध ज्ञेयं प्रहसनन्तु ॥ [38]

Suddha has to involve within the frolicsome conversations of the characters like the venerable ascetics, Bikṣu, the theologists, and Brahmins and has to represent the lowest type of characters.

वेश्या चेट नपुंसक धूर्त विटा बन्धकी च यत्र स्युः ।
अनिभृतवेष परिच्छद चेष्टा करुणात्तु सङ्कीर्णम् ॥[39]

It is *Sañkīrṇa* if a Prahasana consists the characters like prostitutes, servants, impotents, gamblers, paramours and unchaste wives. They have to appear on stage on necessary dress, paraphernalia and movements.

Though Bharata has stated only two divisions verbally, he has indicated one more type namely *Miśra*, which is followed by some later critics.[40] According to Bharata, in the above three divisions of the *Prahasana*, the *Vārta*, the *Dambha* and the debates of the gamblers or the dishonest persons, who are banished from the routine course of the society, should be allowed.

In the above analysis of the *Prahasana* of Bharata, one can easily recognise a speciality. In the '*Suddha Prahasana*' the internal entity plays a better role than the external one. In other words, in accordance with their external entity the personalities of the characters are pure and are expected to be sacred. But gradually such persons have neglected the importance of the supposed internal entity and have applied their minds only on the external form and so Bharata has included them in '*Suddha Prahasana*'. Despite venerable professions, their habits and activities seem very ridiculous, and we are inclined to laugh at them. Thus, the lack of harmony between their profession and activities, make them censurable.

The subject of the *Sañkīrṇa Prahasana* is a different matter. In the behaviour of the characters in the *Sankīrṇa Prahasana*, there is

identity between the internal and external entities. Their activities represent their mentalities Their movements point out their inner opinions. Therefore, they are to be satirised with their professions as well as habits.

So, we may conclude that the *Suddha Prahasana* represents the characters which have no harmony between their occupation and nature, and the *Sañkīrṇa Prahasana* denotes the characters having harmony between those two.

But we cannot find such a keen observation and analysis in classifying the *Prahasana* in the works of the successors of Bharata. In spite of following the definition of Bharata, they shuffled the characters of *Suddha* and *Sañkīrṇa* and therefore it has become complicated to settle any distinction as in the case of Bharata and to accept any particular guideline, Dhananjaya who has paid his attention in elucidating the dramaturgy only has made a three-fold division of the *Prahasana*, According to him any *Prahasana* mixed with the parts of the *Vīthi* is *Vikṛta Prahasana*. The rest are as usual *Suddha* and *Sañkara*. Perhaps the inquisitiveness of Dhananjaya might have incited him to bring out the third division of the *Prahasana*, taking the indication of Bharata, as said previously. But he has replaced the *Sañkīrṇa* with *Miśra* or *Vikṛta*. In defining all these, Dhananjaya has not followed the suggestions of Bharata, but he got them intermixed. The bird's eye view of Bharata is not seen in Dhananjaya and some sort of negligence is seen. In his statement पाखण्डविप्र प्रभृति चेट चेटी समाकुलम् he has included *Vipra* in *Suddha Prahasana* and left out the *Tāpasa* who have the equal candidature with the *Vipra*. They are included in *Sañkīrṇa Prahasana*. The servants, the servant maids and the *Kançukī* are included in the *Suddha Prahasana*. Bharata did not allow such a confusion. Hence, according to Bharata *Sarūpatva* and *Virūpaiva* are the main elements in classifying the *Prahasana*, and according to Dhananjaya *Kāmukatva* and *Akāmukatva* be the basic elements.

But Hemachandra in Kāvyānuśāsana has completely followed the Nāṭya Śāstra in defining and classifying the *Prahasana*.[41] In

Bhāvaprakāśana of Śāradātanaya the influence of both Bharata and Dhananjaya is distinctly visible.[42] He has classified the *Prahasana* into three types and named the *Prahasana* with *Vīthyañga* is as *Sañkīrṇa*. But in the case of *Vikṛta* he said that ascetics and sages disguised as Paramours, and libidinous men should be seen.

After Dhananjaya almost all the critics followed the interpretation and the classification of Dhananjaya with slight difference to make them distinct.

But Viśvanātha in Sahityadarpaṇa and Singabhūpāla in Rasārṇava sudhākara did not allow the characters of *Vīthi* in *Prahasana*. Once again Viswanatha went back to Abhinavagupta[43] and brought out his opinion. Abhinavagupta had quoted the views of some anonymous persons in Abhinavabhārati. They said that a *Prahasana* having only one act was *Suddha* and that having a number of acts and characters was *Sañkīrṇa*. Viswanatha says-

वृत्त बहूनां धृपृष्टनां सङ्कीर्ण केचिदूचिरे ।
तत्पुनर्भवति द्व्यङ्क मथवैकाङ्कनिर्मितम् ॥ [44]

Thus, even after rejecting the existence of the parts of *Vīthi*, Viswanatha has shown three types of *Prahasanas*, by dividing the *Suddha Prahasana* of Bharata into *Suddha* according to the number of acts and characters, allowed in, and agreeing with the *Sañkīrṇa* of Bharata in the name of *Vikṛta*. Here also *Kāmukatva* and *Akāmukatva* are the reasons in the classification of the *Prahasana*

Singabhūpāla has left out the *Vīthyangas* and added the *Prahasanāñgas* but has shown three-fold division of *Prahasana*.[45]

Thus, the Indian critics have analysed the *Prahasana* following only the content therein and the stature of the characters. Despite having the aim of social reformation and sanctification of human tendency, they have taken into consideration neither the type of *Hāsya* nor the purpose of it.

The comedy of Western critics has many divisions, under which many modern Sanskrit *Prahasanas* may be included. So, the

classification of comedy, helps in the classification of the up to date *Prahasana*. Let us examine the same.

To some extent, there is similarity between the *Prahasana* and the comedy of Greek Literature. As said by Aristotle "Comedy is an imitation of character of a low-type, not, however in the sense of bad, the ludicrous being merely a sub division of the ugly. It consists some defect which is not painful or destructive"[46]

This definition of Comedy applies to *Prahasanas* of ancient times. However, the amendment "which is not painful or destructive" may be broken, for in the old *Prahasanas* we see many noble personalities disguised as low-type characters. But comedy requires original low-type characters, I think, but for this everything is equal between the Greek Comedy and ancient *Prahasana*. H.H. Wilson says-

"It is in their extreme indelicacy that they (Prahasana) resemble, although they equal the Greek Comedy scarcely, but they have in their nature not its' redeeming properties, exuberant gaiety and brilliant imagination, they have some causticity and humour, but they are deficient in the high merits of the poetry and wit".[47]

The Western critics classified the comedy according to the chronology such as the old comedy the middle comedy and the new comedy. The old comedy bears small story but redeems well the criticism of the contemporary society and social conditions. An astonishing mixture of fantasy, unsparing statute, brilliant verbal wit, literary and musical parody, lyrics, hard hitting political propaganda and uproarious farce are the main features of the old comedy. At the time of the middle comedy, the theme had certain importance, but at its third stage the Comedy of manners etc., have dominated.

Even in the Indian *Prahasana* there are distinguishing and descriptive features of the *Prahasanas* of different times. In the old *Prahasana* it seems that the poets have followed the statements of

critics. At the second stage as in the case of Hāsyaçuḍāmaṇi Prahasana, there is some change in selecting the theme and characters. Like the Comedy of humours etc, in the Western aesthetics, the *Prahasanas* of the middle age also have concentrated to expose the natural foibles of human psychology and mythology irrespective of their castes and professions. Thus, observing the social customs, formalities and irregularities *Prahasanas* have shaped and shapened themselves in the modern period of Sanskrit literature. There is no object that has not sub-served the *Prahasanas* and there is no social or individual evil that has been left out of the criticism in the modern Sanskrit *Prahasanas*, like the western comedy of the modern times. So we can apply the classification of Comedy, to the classification of the *Prahasana* to a larger extent

[48]Comedy is also divided as, Farce, Comedy of humours, Comedy of manners, Domestic Comedy, Comedy of intrigue, Comedy of morals, Comedy of ideas, Comedy of satires, symbolic comedy, Dark comedy etc, We will consider the definitions of various types of Comedy, which are applicable to the *Prahasanas*, at the time of studying them in connection with the *Hāsya* in the later chapters, in detail.

Among *Rūpakas* and *Uparūpakas* of the Sanskrit drama there are certain types having close affinity with the *Prahasana*. It is said previously that the *Prahasanas* being of one of the early stages in the chronological development Sanskrit dramas, has become a vital element to *Nātya* etc. the major plays along with other one-act plays like the *Bhāna* etc. So, it is not necessary to deal with the affinity between the *Prahasana* and major Sanskrit dramas. But even some *Rūpakas* and *Uparūpakas* have deep affinity with the *Prahasana*. As ours is the study in connection with the *Hāsya* in the *Prahasanas* let us find out the similarity and difference regarding the importance of the Comic only in the other types.

Among *Rūpakas*, the *Bhāṇa* and the *Vīthī* are the plays that are similar to the *Prahasana* to some extent. The critics while defining

the *Bhāṇa* have allowed both *Sṛñgāra* and *Vīra* as the main sentiments in the *Bhāṇa*.[49] But some of the poets admitted *Vīra* in their works, it was in the shape of *Ābhāsa* only. It certainly results in the *Hāsya*. Even the *Sṛngāra* with its fallacious appearance ceases to evoke the *Sṛngāra* and activates the spectators to realise the Comic only. The importance of the ingenuity and wit and humour introduced in the *Bhāṇas* enhances the effect of the *Hāsya* very well. The plots of the *Bhāṇa* are also very close to the plots of the ancient *Prahasana*. Jokes, ironical ludicrous behaviour and incongruities are well developed in the *Bhāṇas*. The pun is also extremely co-operative to redeem them. The irregular and irresponsible *Sṛñgāra* has exchanged its form to the Comic in the *Bhāṇas*. The comedy of humour and manners and the satirical comedy appear in the *Bhāṇas*. But the mode of representation and technique and the number of characters allowed in separate the *Bhāṇa* from the *Prahasana*. If, all the characters in the *Bhāṇas*, which are not appearing on the stage but are only indicated through *Ākāśabhāṣita*, are brought on to the stage, the *Bhāṇa*, no doubt, becomes an ancient *Prahasana*. Sri Balantrapu Rajanikanta Rao made the experiment while translating Ubhayābhisārika of Vararuchi[50] and *Dhūrta Viṭa Samvādā* of Eswaradatta[51] and has succeeded. In fact, *Prahasana* is the developed from of *Bhāṇa*.

Vīthī is also very close to the *Prahasana.*[52] The nature of the characters, the mode of the contents and the importance of *Hāsya* are equal in both of them. We could not see the three unities namely, unity of action, unity of place and unity of time in a *Vīthī* but many *Prahasanas* contain these three. If the *Bhāṇa* has included one more character in it, then it becomes a *Vīthī*. In other words, if enacted by only one character, it is *Bhāṇa*, if two characters it is *Vīthī* and if many characters it is *Prahasana*. Though the critics have admitted all the sentiments into the *Prahasana*, in practice it is not more than *Bhāṇa* and therefore, subserves the *Sṛñgāra* and *Hāsya* sentiments. We should not forget that many features of the *Vīthī* namely *Nālikā*, *Asatpralāpa, Prapanca* etc., proclaim their support to provoke the *Hāsya*.

In *Uparūpaka*, *Prasthāna*, *Durmallikā*, *Kāvya* and *Preraṇa* are very close to the *Prahasana*

प्रस्थानं कैशिकी वृत्ति युतं हीनोपनायकम् ।
आपान केलि ललितं लय ताल कलायुतम् ॥
दासादि नायकं द्व्यङ्कं विट चेटादि नायकम् ।
मुखनिर्वहणोपेतं श्रृङ्गारतिलकं यथा ॥[53]

Though this definition of *Prasthāna* has hardly noted the importance of the *Hāsya* in it, there is every possibility of introducing it in *Prasthāna*, according to the contents supposed like the हीनोपनायकता i. e., the presence of a side-hero who is worse and विट चेटादि नायकता i.e., the appearance of *Viṭa* and *Ceṭa* etc, as the heroes with special reference to *Āpānakeli*. Generally, a Paramour, as described by the critics, indulges in love and exposes it in the form of *Sṛngārābhāsa*, which in the other words is called *Hāsya*. The entire Bhāṇa literature comes in support of this. Even in the *Nāṭakas* except one or two like *Mṛcchakaṭika*, the character of *Viṭa* is associated with *Hāsya* only. In *Prasthāna*, the pastimes at taverns especially invite the attention of the spectators to relish the comic. It will be just like a Picnic of modern days. So, the relation- ship between *Prasthāna* and *Prahasana* is parallel to the relationship between *Bhāṇa* and *Prahasana*.

Coming to *Kāvya*, it is nearer to the *Prahasana* than the *Prasthāna*. Bhāvaprakāśana divides *Kāvya* into two. It is defined as-

काव्यं सहास्यशृङ्गारं सर्ववृत्तिसमन्वितम् । सभग्नतालद्विपदी खण्डमात्रा परिष्कृतम् ।
गर्भावमर्श सन्धिभ्यां हीनमेकाङ्कमेव च। क्वचिल्लास्ययुतं वा स्याद्विट चेटीसमन्वितम् ॥
कुलाङ्गनावेशयुतं ललितोदात्त नायकम् । एवं प्रकल्पयेत्काव्यं तद्गौडबिजयो यथा ॥
विप्रामात्यवणिक्पुत्र नायिका नायकोज्ज्वलम् । मुदित प्रमदा भाषा चेष्टितैरन्तरान्तरा ॥
ग्रथितं विट चेटादि वेषभाषाभिरेव वा । एवञ्च कल्पयेत्काव्यं यथा सुग्रीव खेलनम् ॥ [54]

The first type of *Kāvya*, being a one-act play with characters like paramours and servants, staged at the localities of either prostitutes or respectable women, has a close affinity with the *Prahasana.* Hence in *Kāvya, Sṛñgāra* is subserved by *Hāsya* where as in the

Prahasana, the *Hāsya* is being followed by the *Sṛñgāra*. This is in accordance with the stature of the heroes described in them. The hero of *Kāvya* is *Lalita* and *Uddhata* but the hero of a *Prahasana* is a *Viṭa*, *Ceṭa* and so on. But the subject with "*Hāsya* and *Sṛñgāra*" is hardly impossible in the *Prahasana*, for most of the ancient *Prahasanas* are not without *Sṛñgāra*. So, *Kāvya* is a noble *Prahasana* dedicated to the development of polished *Hāsya*. It is noteworthy that H. H. Wilson has completely neglected the importance of Comic in *Kāvya* saying "The Kaavya is a love story in one act interspersed with poetical stanzas and musical airs. The *Yādavodaya* is an example".[55]

The *Durmallika*[56] and the *Prahasana* are fully identical leaving one or two minor differences. To quote Wilson "The *Durmallika* is a comic intrigue in four acts, in (each of) which the hero and his friends successively lead the business"[57]

Durmallika is not less than a *Prahasana* but composed in four acts with different heroes in different acts. *Durmallika* is an inconsistent to the views of many modern critics, that, except the *Prahasana*, no other type of Sanskrit drama is comic oriented. Though it is an *Uparūpaka* it contains four acts like the *Nāṭika*. *Viṭa* and *Vidūṣaka*, the heroes of the first and second acts respectively evoke *Hāsya* with their dominating nature. Perhaps *Pīṭhamarda* the hero of the third act may not allow *Hāsya* completely. In the fourth act once again *Viṭa* and *Vidūṣaka* are associated with *Pīṭhamarda*. Moreover, the contents excepted there in *Durmallika* like '*Çauryarati*', '*Grāmyakatha*' and '*Dhanaikāśā*' are also dedicated to *Hāsya*. Thus *Durmallika*, is a *Prahasana*, but larger than the one-act *Prahasana*, one of the ten *Rūpakas*. It comes under the category of the comedy of intrigue.[58]

There is one more *Uparūpaka* namely *Rāsaka* in which *Hāsya* is the main sentiment. It is a comic entertainment in one act with five characters. The hero and the heroine are of elevated ranks, the latter is of suitable merit, the former a fool.[59] According to this definition, the plot of the *Rāsaka* is unlike those ancient *Prahasana*, but we should

not forget that the themes of the modern *Prahasana* are very much polished and fascinating. Thus, the *Rāsaka* appears like the *Prahasana* of modern times creating polished comic.

Hemaçandra in Kāvyānuśāsana enumerates one more drama namely '*Preraṇa*', defining it as हास्यप्रायं प्रेरणन्तु स्यात्प्रहेलिकयान्वितम्.[60] *Prahelikās* are well known to Sanskrit readers. They are very charming and at the same time entertain the intelligentsia. So, the *Preraṇa*, full of *Prahelikās* is also meant for intellectuals. Thus, ordinary mediocre spectators are not suitable to enjoy the *Preraṇa*. Generally, *Hāsya* is based on immediate response are reaction of the readers or spectators. So, though *Preraṇa* is intended to take up and develop the comic within, it is too difficult to be enjoyed immediately by common spectators.

According to the Indian critics, *Prahasana* and *Vīthi* are the parts of *Bhāratīvṛtti* which is part and parcel of the prelude (*Prastāvana*). But the *Prahasana* and the *Vīthī* are not defined. If the *Prahasana* and the *Vīthī,* are the two types of the Sanskrit drama, how should they subserve the *Bhāratīvṛtti*?

Though *Vīthī* is also mentioned as one of the parts of *Bhāratīvṛtti*,[61] it means the limbs of *Vīthī* only under the name *Vīthyangās*. Let us apply the same in the case of the *Prahasana* also. Thus, the *Prahasana* means the *Prahasanāngas* only. *Singabhūpāla*, the only rhetorician to adduce the *Prahasanāngas* in detail, enumerates the following ten as the *Prahasanāngas.*

अॅवलगित मवस्कन्दो व्यवहारो विप्रलम्भ मुपपत्तिश्च ।
भयमनृत विभ्रान्तिः गद्गद वाक् च प्रलापश्च ॥[62]

So, some of the above ten types of the *Prahasanāngas* that provoke the comic and inspire the spectators to be entertained by the play, may be acceded in the *Bhāratīvṛtti* but these two are different. However, *Bhāratīvṛtti* is trifling. As we are already said that *Prahasana* is the primary stage of the Sanskrit drama, it might have contributed little or more to the *Prahasana* to subserve the *Bhāratīvṛtti* in the later development of the dramaturgy and drama.

Prahasana Within Naṭaka-

Before dealing with the full-pledged *Prahasana* in connection with the *Hāsya*, let us see some *Prahasanas* within the *Nāṭaka*, *Prakaraṇa* etc., major plays.

We see the form of the *Prahasana* in the *Nāṭakas* and *Prakaraṇas* at many an instance whenever there is scope to nourish the *Hāsya*. In the western plays, to quote Mr. Rickett "the comic scenes were introduced to relieve the seriousness of these medieval problem plays. The vice, a character peculiar to morality, was allowed to enter, between the scenes and amuse the people with a humorous interlude".[63] The India critics have no order like that in the evolution of *Hasya*. Nevertheless, in practice, in every drama we witness the position parallel to the statement of Mr. Rickett. There are many scenes and discourses between the acts in favour of comic to relieve the spectators of the tension. Almost all those scenes are mingled with the structure of the play. But there are some, which if separated can stand in a complete form of a *Prahasana* and enlighten the audience. Now let us see such *Prahasanas*.

In the second act of the Mṛcchakaṭika, the part, beginning with the entrance of Samvāhaka and ending with his stepping into Vasantasenā's house, is an enchanting and elegant *Prahasana*. Likewise, *Sakara's* killing Vasantasena is an enrapturing *Prahasana* in the eighth act.

In the second act, the fragments of comedy of humours and farce are seen diffused. Evil habits are the chief defect of human life. The difficulties and defeats, that the human race has to face are described through the character of Samvāhaka in the second act of Mṛcchakaṭika But in treatment, there are many exaggerations, quarrels, pseudo-logic etc., to provoke *Hāsya* and therefore it has taken the shape of a farce. The approach of Śūdraka, the author of Mṛcchakaṭika is parallel to that of Ben Jonson whose comedy, says Hudson "is not the world of romance but the contemporary London life with its manners, types, foibles and affectations".[64] So, the aim and the world

of Śūdraka's comedy is to project the contemporary Indian society and its' common evil personalities and to point out the detriment due to them. Samvāhaka and his colleagues represent them.

Samvāhaka is a gambler. He seems as if he is a club-mate of the gambler, who appears in the tenth Maṇḍala of *Ṛgveda* in the hymn of the Gambler. Being indebted ten *Suvarṇas* to his friends in gambling Samvāhaka tries to escape from the gambling place. His fellow-gamblers Māthura and Dyūtakara follow him up. Samvāhaka trying to get rid of them wants to hide in a ruined temple nearby, moving in backward direction slowly, so that his footsteps may not be recognised. He stands there like a goddess. Here the exaggeration of his actions drives us to laugh at him. But being cleverer than Samvāhaka, his friends recognise his plan of moving in backward direction. However, it, being unable to find him out they begin to gamble there itself.

After seeing them gambling Samvāhaka suffers and feels a lot to control himself. Then he epigrammatically explains the state of his mind in this verse.

कन्ता शब्दो निर्नाणकस्य हरित हृदयं मनुष्यस्य ।
ढक्का शब्द इव नराधिपस्य प्रभ्रष्टराज्यस्य ॥[65]

Despite his hastened efforts to control himself, he exposes his miserable desire to gambling. Like his forerunner the gambler in *Ṛgveda* he thinks that the sound of the dice thrown on the dais robs his heart.[66] At that very minute Māthura and *Dyūtakara* happen to quarrel for something. Then Samvāhaka again failing to control himself comes forth saying 'mine'. After their primary punishment Samvāhaka follows a false logic about the discharge of his debt. Read the discourse.

संवा:- अर्धं तुभ्यं ददामि अर्धं में मुञ्चतु

द्यूत:- एवं भवतु

संवा : (सभिकमुपगम्य) अर्धस्य गण्डं करोमि अर्धमपि आयो मुञ्चतु

माथु : अत्र को दोषः? एवं भवतु

संवा : (प्रकाशम्) आर्या अर्धं त्वया मुक्तम्?

माथु : मुक्तम्

संवा : (द्यूतकर प्रति) अर्धं त्वयापि मुक्तम्

द्यूत : मुक्तम्

संवा : तद्गमिष्यामि तावत्

Taking the two halves given up by them individually Samvāhaka feels that the entire debt is excused up and prepares to go, resulting in a big quarrel leading to a farce. Then enters Darduraka out of gambling due to lack of entity only. Being an experienced gambler, he teaches many lessons. He tries to replace Samvāhaka and occupy his seat, resulting in another conflict. Samvāhaka extricates himself and runs away,

The elements of the comedy of humours and farce are shuffled and utilised here. Separated from the second act of *Mṛcchakaṭika* this scene can stand as an original and beautiful *Prahasana*.

But the scene in the eighth act is only a farce. Despite the appearance of many characters like the ascetic, the paramour, the servant, Śakāra and Vasantasenā, Śakāra plays major role and triumphs over all the other characters. He is foolish and proud. Unfortunately, Śakāra is a ruler whose deeds always result in the grievances of others. Here, the poet has to point out the wickedness of Śakāra but instead Śūdraka exhibits the defects and distractions in his deeds and suggests that Śakāra is a man to be satirized. Thus, this is a farce on one hand and on the other a satire. Many kinds of non-sense, foolish statements, false reasonings etc, appear in Śakāra's dialogues and cause mirth. He orders hi servant to drive the bullock-cart through the dilapidated walls. See how proud and foolish he is!

अरे! राजश्यालकोऽहम्। वृषभौ म्रियेते! आपरौ क्रेष्यामि। प्रवहणं भग्नं भवति । अपरं कारयिष्यामि । त्वं मृतः अन्यः प्रवाहको भविष्यति।

The result of such farce is the purification of the hearts of the spectators. Here the Katharsis takes place through pleasure but not by pity and fear as Aristotle says. P. P. Mehta in his Comedy points out the same as "By inference we may say that in Comedy the Katharsis (Purgation) is through pleasure"67. This type of Comic is distorted but is not distressing. It only criticises but does not hurt any body's feeling.

There is one more *Prahasana* in the third act of Nāgānaḍa of Śrīharṣa dealt with the exaggeration of the characters and action. The scene moves with *Viṭa, Ceṭa, Ceṭī*, and *Vidūṣaka*.

Viṭa enters the stage followed *by Ceṭa,* who carries a wine pot over his shoulders. They search for Navamālikā, the servant maid. Being a drunkard, he asseverates the importance of drinking by an epigram as-

नित्यं यः पिबति सुरां प्रिय सङ्गमञ्च यः करोति ।

मम तो द्वावेव देवौ बलदेवो कामदेवश्च ॥[68]

Then *Vidūṣaka* disguised as a lady with a pair of silk clothes, rewarded at the marriage function, enters the stage in his attempt to drive away the bees attacking him. After seeing *Vidūṣaka*, *Viṭa* takes him to Navamālika and expresses his love for Navamālika by giving some gift. *Vidūṣaka* turns aside, but *Viṭa* mistaking that she is angry, tries to fall at her feet.

At that very moment Navamālika enters on the stage. Enjoying the farce she pretends to be angry with *Viṭa*, her love. But *Viṭa* entrusting *Ceṭa* to hold up *Vidūṣaka* begs Navamālika to pardon him. Meanwhile, *Vidūṣaka* tries to flee but fails. At the end, all of them apologise to *Vidūṣaka*.

In fact, here the characters subserve the scene. But there is no dialogue that criticises or hurts any person of tradition or custom of the contemporary society, because it does not deal with the virtues and defects of human tendencies, in particular. Though the *Avaidikatva* of *Vidūṣaka* is mocked, it is only personal but not generalised. Hence the exaggeration of action is well developed here to evoke the comic.

The third act in Prabodhaçandrodaya except a bit at the beginning is a *Prahasana*. All the characters are symbolic representing the religious theories and traditions of *Bauddha*, *Jaina* and *Soma*. Basing on the characters, Kṛṣṇamiśra, the author made an effort to bring out the good and evil of those theories. Hence this is a satirical Comedy as well as the Comedy of morals[69] and ideas.[70] Kṣapaṇaka, Bhikṣu and Kapāli and *Kāpālikā* representing the religions *Jaina, Bauddha* and *Soma* respectively are characterised in this act. Gradually the followers of Buddhism have become lazy and irregular and pulled down the importance and honour bestowed on Buddhism. One will regret to say with the historical evidence that gradually *Buddhaaraamas* have become brothel houses. Kṛṣṇamiśra himself in Prabodhaçandrodaya mocks at it, by addressing *Bhikṣu* as '*Vihāra Dāsī Bhujanga*'. While trying to attract the *Buddha Bhikṣu* and *Kṣapaṇaka, Kṣapaṇika* explains how the theory of *Soma* is of great Importance. Read-

दृष्टं क्वापि सुरां विना न विषयै रानन्द बोधोज्झितैः
जीवस्य स्थितिरेव मुक्ति रुपलावस्था कथं प्रार्थते ।
पार्वत्या समरूपया दयितया सानन्द मालिङ्गितो
मुक्तः क्रीडति चन्द्रचूड वपुरित्यूचे मृडानीपतिः ॥[71]

After murmuring this theory silently, *Buddha Bhikṣu* and *Kṣapaṇaka*, who indulged in satiating their desires and passions secretly, feel as if there in front of the God, offering gifts. In addition to the statement, *Kapāli* offers a free gift, the embrace of *Kāpālikā,* which is ranked in defeating the other two. Immediately *Bhikṣu* reinterpret. the *Buddhism* with his own knowledge running with passions as-

क्षणिकाः संस्काराः । नाध्ध्यात्मा स्थायी। तस्मात् भिक्षिषु परदारानाक्रमत्सु अपि नेर्षितव्यम् । चित्तमलं हि यदीर्ष्या नाम ।

Buddha has already explained his holiness in Dhammapada as-

अनिक्कसावो कासावं यो वत्थं परिदहेस्सति
अपेतो दमसच्छेन न सो कासाव मरहति।[72]

But unfortunately, unworthy Buddhist ascetics have destroyed Buddhism. After watching the pitiable deterioration in Buddhism Krishna Misra has rightly derided the Buddhist ascetics in the following verse.

आवासो लयनं मनोहर मभिप्रायानुरूपा वणिङ्
नायों वाञ्छित कालमिष्टमशनं शय्या मृदुप्रस्तरा ॥[73]

But Buddha's definition of the ascetics as is shown in the following lines is totally indifferent, their ways impracticable.

हत्थसञ्ञतो पाद सञ्ञतो वाचाय सञ्ञतो सञ्ञतुतमो ।
अज्जत्तरतो समाहितो एको सन्तुसितो तमाहु भिक्खुं ॥[74]

After getting the acceptance of *Bhikṣu* and *Kṣapaṇaka* to join in *Soma* religion, *Kapāli* offers wine and all of them drink, prattle and dance together. Their awkward behaviour however provokes the *Hāsya*. In every part of this *Prahasana* the poet exposes only the demerits and defects.

This *Prahasana* in Prabodhaçandrodaya has affinity neither to the Prahasana in Mṛcchakaṭika nor to the *Prahasana* in Nāgānanda. Nāgānanda contains a farce, Mṛcchakaṭika contains both a farce and a comedy of humours, but Prabodhaçandrodaya contains a Satire mixed with the comedy of moral and ideas.

FOOT-NOTES

1. प्र हस-भावे ल्युट् (प्रहास) प्रहसत्यत्र अनेन वा
   प्र हस आधारे करणे वा ल्युट् रूपक भेद ।
   परिहासः (मेदिनी) आक्षेपः (हेमचन्द्रः) Sabdakalpadruma Vol. III P. 303
2. Nāṭya Śāstra 18/103 to 107
3. Daśarūpaka 3/54 to 56
4. तद्वदिति भाणवद्वस्तु सन्ध्यङ्गानामतिदेशः Dhanika - Ibid - P. 159
5. Nāṭyadarpaṇa 2/83
6. Bhāvaprakāśana 8/275 to 280
7. Sāhityadarpaṇa 6/264, 265
८. भाणः स्याद्धूर्तचरितो नानावस्थान्तरात्मकः ॥
   एकाङ्क एक एवात्र निपुणः पण्डितो विटः ।
   रङ्गे प्रकाशयेत्स्वेनानुभूतमितरेण वा ॥
   सम्बोधनोक्ति प्रत्युक्ती कुर्यादाकाशभाषितैः ।
   सूचयेद्वीर शृङ्गरौ शौर्यसोभाग्य संस्तवैः ॥
   तत्रेत्तिवृत्त मुत्पाद्यं वृत्तिः प्रायेण भारती ।
   मुखनिर्वहणौ सन्धी लास्याङ्गानि दशापि च ॥ Saahityadarpana 6/227 to 230
9. Rasārṇavasudhākara 3/268, 269
9. (a) -Ibid- 3/270
९० वस्तु नेता रस स्तेषां भेदकाः Daśarūpaka 1/11
९९. सामदाने भेद दण्डे प्रत्युत्पन्नमतिर्वधः ।
   गोत्रस्खलितमोजश्च धीः कोधः साहसं भयम् ॥
   माया च सहुतिः भ्रान्तिः दूत्यं हेत्ववधारणम् ।
   स्वप्नलेखौ मदश्चित्र मित्येतान्येकविंशतिः Rasārṇavasudhākara 3/81, 82
12. Abhinavabhārati Vol. II P. 449
९३. उद्घात्यकादिभिः वीथ्यङ्गैः मिश्रितं भवेन्मिश्रम् । Naatya Śātra 20/111

९४.	विकृतं सङ्कराद्वीथ्या	Daśarūpaka 3/56
९५.	उद्धात्यकादिभिः वीथ्यङ्गैः मिश्रं सङ्कीर्ण मुच्यचे ।	Bhāvaprakāśana 8/270
९६.	यद्वीथ्यङ्गैः समाकीर्णं सङ्कीर्णं धूर्तसङ्कुलम् ।	Prataaparudriya- Nataka-44
९७.	उद्धात्यकावलगिते प्रपञ्चत्रिगते छलम् वाक्केल्यधिबले गण्डमवस्यन्दित नालिके ॥ असत्प्रलाप व्याहार मृदवानि त्रयोदश ।	Dasarupaka 3/12, 13
९८.	गूढार्थापर पर्याय माला प्रश्नोत्तरस्य वा । यत्रान्योन्यं समालापो द्वेधोद्धात्यं तदुच्यते ॥	Ibid 3/13, 14
९९.	यत्रैकत्र समावेशात्कार्य मन्यत् प्रसाध्यते । प्रस्तुतेऽन्यत्र वान्यत्स्यात् तच्चावलगितण् द्विधा ॥	Ibid 3/14, 15
२०.	असद्भूतं मिथः स्तोत्रं प्रपञ्चो हास्यकृन्मतम् ।	Ibid 3/15
२९.	श्रुति साम्यादनेकार्थ योजनं त्रिगतं त्विह । नटादित्रितयालापः पूर्वरङ्गं तदिष्यते ॥	Ibid 3/16
२२.	सोपहासा निगूढार्थ्था नालिकैव प्रहेलिका	Ibid 3/19
२३.	असम्बद्ध कथाप्रायोऽसत्प्रलापो यथोत्तरः	Ibid 3/20
२४.	अन्यार्थमेव व्याहारो हास्यलोभकरं वचः	Ibid 3/20
25.	Dasarupaka	3/52, 53
२६.	अन्यासंगम शङ्किन्या नायकस्यातिरोषया । प्रच्छेदकप्रकटनं लास्यं प्रच्छेदकं विदुः ।	Ibid 3/242
२७.	कोपप्रसाद जनितं साधिक्षेपपदाश्रयम् वाक्यं तदुक्तप्रत्युक्तं यूनोः प्रश्नोत्तरात्मकम् ।	Ibid 3/247
28.	Naatya Saastra	20/73
29.	Naatya Saastra – Baroda Foot Note of M. R. Kavi	Vol. III P 105
30.	Abhinavabhaarati	Vol.I P. 45

31. Comedy P. 68

३२. स्त्रीनीच प्रकृतावेष भूयिष्ठं दृश्यते रसः । Naatya Saatra 6/51

33. The new dictionary of thoughts P. 706

34. Naatya Saastra 25/113

35. Dasarupaka 3/4

36 For more details see “Sanskrta Bhaana Saahityam”
PP From 14 to 21

37. For more details Ibid

38. Naatyasaatra 23/107, 108

39. Naatyasaatra 23/109

४०. उद्धात्यकादिभिः वीथ्यङ्गैः मिश्रितं भवेन्मिश्रम् । Ibid 30/111

४१. प्रहसनमपि विज्ञेयं शुद्धं तथैव सङ्कीर्णम् ।
वक्ष्यामि तयोर्युक्त्या पृथक् पृथग्लक्षण विशेषान् ॥
भगवत्तापसविप्रैरन्यैरपि हासवाद सम्बद्धम् ।
कापुरुषसम्प्रयुक्तं परिहासाभाषणप्रायम् ॥
अविकृत भाषाचारं विशेषभावोपपन्नचरित मिदम् ।
नियतिगति वस्तुविषयं शुद्धं ज्ञेयं पृहसनन्तु ॥
वेश्या चेट नपुंसक विट धूर्ता बन्धकी च यत्र स्युः ।
अनियत वेषपरिच्छद चेष्टितकरणंच सङ्कीर्णम् ॥ Kaavyaanusaasana P. 388

४२. तत्र श्रोत्रिय निर्ग्रन्ध शाक्यादीनां यथायथम् ।
भाषा चेष्टित तद्रूप हास्य वाक्य समन्वितम् ॥
चेट चेटी विटव्याप्तं शुद्धं प्रहसनं भवेत् ।
उद्धात्यकादिभिः वीथ्यङ्गैः मिश्रं सङकीर्ण मुच्यते ॥
विटकामुक चेटादि वचो वेषधरैस्तु यत् ।
परिव्राण्मुनिषण्डाद्यैः कृतं वैकृत मुच्यते ॥ Bhaavaprakasana 8/275 to 278

४३. प्रहसनस्य अङ्कनियमानभिधानात् –
शुद्धमेकाङ्कं सङ्कीर्णन्तु अनेकाङ्कं वेश्यादि संख्या बाहुल्यादिति केचित्
Abhinavabhaarati Vol. II P.449

44. saahityadarpana 6/268

45. शुद्धं कीर्णं वैकृतञ्च तच्च प्रहसनं त्रिधा ।
शुद्धं श्रोत्रियशोभादेः वेषभापादिसंयुतम् ॥
चेट चेटी जन व्याप्तं कीर्णं लक्ष्यं निरूप्यताम् ।
आनन्दकोश प्रमुखं वैकृतं तदुदाहृतम् ॥ Rasaarnavasudhaakara 3/278, 279

46. Poetics P. 21

47. Dramas P, 27, 28

48. A Dictionary of Literary Terms... P. 136

49. भाणस्तु धूर्त चरितं स्वानुभूतं परेण वा ।
यत्रोपवर्णयेदेको निपुणः पण्डितो विटः ॥
सम्बोधनोक्ति प्रत्युक्ती कुर्यादकाशभाषितैः ।
सूचयेद्वीर शृङ्गारौ शौर्यसौभाग्यसंस्तवैः ॥
भूयसा भारती वृत्तिरेकाङ्गं वस्तु कल्पितम् ।
मुखनिर्वहणौ साङ्गौ लास्याङ्गनि दशापि च ॥ Dasarupaka 3/49 to 51

50. Bhaarati (Telugu monthly) 1972 April

51. Bhaarati (Telugu monthly) 1975 January and February

52. वीथी तु कैशिकी वृत्तौ सन्ध्यङ्गाङ्कै स्तु भाणवत् ।
रसः सूच्यस्तु शृङ्गारः स्पृशेदपि रसान्तरम् ॥
युक्ता प्रस्तावनाख्यातैः अङ्गै रुद्धात्यकादिभिः ।
एवं वीथी विधातव्या सेकपात्र प्रयोजिता ॥ Dasarupaka 3/68 to 70

53. Bhaavaprakaasana 9/80, 81

54. Ibid 9/82 to 86

55. Drama p. 31

56. अथ दुर्मल्लिका नाम प्रौढा नागर नायिका ।
चतुरङ्का चतुरसन्धिः गर्भसन्धिविना कृतम् ॥

विटो विलसति स्वैरं प्रथमाङ्के द्विनाडिकाः ।
विदूषको द्वितीयाङ्के विलसत् पञ्च नाडिकाः ॥
पीठमर्थो विहरति तृतीये सप्त नाडिकाः ।
विटादित्रितय क्रीडा चतुर्थे दश नाडिकाः ।
चौर्यरतिं प्रतिभेदं यूनोरन्योन्यवर्णनं क्वापि ।
यत्र ग्राम्य कथाभिः कुरुते किल दूतिका रहसि ॥
मन्त्रयति च तद्विषयं न्यग्जातित्रेन याचते च वातु ।
लब्ध्वापि लब्धुमिच्छति या सा दुर्मल्लिका नाम्ना ॥

Bhaavaprakaasana 9/128 to 132

57. Dramas P. 32

58. Comedy of intrigue or situation comedy is a term sometimes used by critics to define a play in which humour depends mainly upon intricate plotting, hair breadth escapes and rapidly changing situations - Comedy P. 61, 62

59. Dramas P. 31

60. Kaavyaanusaasana P. 393

61. भारती संस्कृत प्रायो वाग्व्यापारो नटाश्रयः ।
भेदैः प्ररोचनायुक्तैः वीथीप्रहसनामुखैः ॥ Dasarupaka 3/5

62. Rasaarnavasudhaakara 3/270.

63. A History of English Literature P. 95

64. An outline history of English Literature P. 77

65. Mrcchakatika Act II V. 5

66. जानामि न क्रीडिष्यापि सुमेरूशिखर पतनसन्निभं द्यूतम् ।
तथापि खलु कोकिलमधुरः कत्ताशब्दो मनो हरति । Mrcchakatika 2/16

Compare with-

यदादीव्ये न दविषाण्येभिः परायद्भूयोऽवहीये सखिभ्यः ।
न्युप्राश्च बभ्रवो वाचमक्रत एमीदेषां निष्कृतं जारिणीव ॥

67. Comedy P. 64

68. Naagaananda 3/1

69. The morality is a drama in which the characters are allegorical, symbolical or abstract, the main philosophy of the play being didactic- A History of English Literature P. 95

70. A term loosely applied to plays which tend to debate in a witty and humorous fashion, the ideas and theories.
Dictionary of Literary terms P. 137

71. Prabodha Çandrodaya 3/14

72. Dhamapada - Yamakavaggo 9

छाया: अनिष्कषायः काषायं यो वस्त्रं परिधत्स्यति ।
अपेतो दमसत्याभ्यां न सः काषायमर्हति ॥

73. Prabhodha Candrodaya 3/9

74. Dhammapada – Bhikkuvaggo 3

छाया :- हस्तसंयतः पादसंयतः वाचासंयतः संयतोत्तमः ।
अध्यात्मरतः समाहितः एकस्सन्तुष्ट स्तमाहुर्भिक्षुम् ॥

PART-II

PRAHASANAS

FARCE

Now, let us deal with the *Hāsya* with reference to the *Prahasana* in detail. There are about one hundred and fifty *Prahasanas* in Sanskrit. Some of them like 'Ṡaṡikalā' 'Sairandhrikā' 'Kandarpakēli' etc., are known only through the references of certain critics, but we know little about them. Some of them like Ānandakoṡa Prahasana from which examples are given in Rasārṇavasudhākara, are not available now. Unfortunately, many valuable *Prahasanas* are yet to come to light. This chapter deals with the well-known and the important *Prahasanas.*

In referring to the theory of *Hāsya* in the *Prahasana*, I followed the classification of the comedy of the western critics for the following reasons. The classification of the *Prahasana* of the oriental critics is confusing. It is not much helpful as it depends only on the quality of the enlisted characters instead of the quality of the plot. And some of the modern *Prahasanas* have none of the characters prescribed by critics in Sanskrit Poetics. If we have to follow the classification of oriental critics, it is just as *Ṡuddha*, *Vikṛta* and *Sañkīrṇa* which is not possible for implementation in modern *Prahasanas*. It is not applicable even for the old Prahasanas as the classification, based on the characters, only is varied and complicated.

On the other hand, the classification of the western critics is very subtle and extensive. Many categories they have made are seen in Sanskrit *Prahasanas* also. The study of the contemporary society and the literature of other Indian and foreign Languages has influenced the Sanskrit play-wrights and they accepted many modern tendencies in writing *Prahasanas*, which go near the classification done by the Western critics. The development of the sublimity in selecting the plot and its treatment range have enriched the *Prahasana* literature and the same leads me to study them according to the classification of Western critics.

Though there are many types of comedy of western critics which not seen in Sanskrit, are taken into account here; such as Farce, Satire etc.

FARCE

The general definition of *Prahasana* given by eastern critics is fully applicable to the farce of the western literature. In one word, all Sanskrit *Prahasanas* of ancient times and some of the modern times are only farce. The latest development in *Prahasana* have given scope to other types of *Prahasana* also like Comedy of humours, parody, satire etc.

According to western critics, the object of a farce is "to provoke the spectator to laughter not of the reflective kind which the Comedy is intended to elicit, but the uncomplicated response of sudden appearance or disclosure, the mechanism suggested by many physical actions, repetitions, gross exaggeration of character and so on".[1]

Farce depends mainly upon the plot and situations and their consequences. Even the character or dialogue has no importance in it. As it requires pure exaggeration of a situation and character, sharp wit has less importance in farce. In farce, character and dialogue are subsequent to plot and literature.

According to Cudden "exaggerated physical action, exaggeration of character and situation, absurd situation and improbable events and surprise in form of unexpected appearances and discourses"[2] are the basic elements of farce.

Taking the choice of exaggerating the situations and characters, some of the Sanskrit writers of *Prahasana* have gone to extremes, beyond the limits of delicacy and civility. Some of them have given wide scope to vulgarity, which made it indecent to read them in the midst of a group of elite scholars.

LATAKAMELAKAM

Laṭakamēlaka written by Sankhadhara is a *Prahasana* having the lion's share in guiding the later *Farces* like Hāsyārṇava Prahasana etc. In accordance with the nature and style of this *Prahasana*, it has to be enumerated in the list of *Farces*, but Sankhadhara intended his work to be a Comedy of manners and morals, and he dealt with the

contemporaries who were degraded, and outcast. He wished to satirise and moralise the black-list.[3] But the nature of dealing with the black-list, places this Prahasana in the list of *Farces*.

According to Sanskrit rhetoricians, Laṭakamēlaka falls under *Saṅkīrṇa Prahasana* in two acts. Lajjāvikraya or giving up shyness is the name of the first act, which takes place in the residence of courtesan. Danturā is a bawd. Her daughter Madanamanjari plays the key role in the play. Sabhāsali, a great scholar enters the court of Danturā, after a clash with his wife Kalahapriyā. He is accompanied by his disciple Kulavyādhi. A bone of a fish pricks in the throat of Madanamanjari. Jantukētu, a physician enters to treat her. He explains physiology and various theories of medicine which are not practicable. Then enters Jaṭāsura, a professor in *Jainism* and Ajnānarāśi, a worshipper of Sakti. Their quarrel lasts for some time. Sabhāsali justifies it. All these black sheep see only Madanamanjari, who is ill. Jaṭāsura showing his bravery takes a stick and drives them out.

Danturā Pariṇaya is the second act. At first, king Sangrāmavisara enters the stage with his companion Viśwasaghātuka. Then comes Jhakaṭakasāra from whom Sangrāmavisara has purchased a dog and presented it to Danturā. After a while Mithyāśukla and Punkaṭamiśra enter and scold each other. Mithyāśukla drives away Punkaṭamiśra. Vyasanākara, a resident of Ṣandanasēnāvihāra appears mocking Buddhism. Digambara drives away Vyasanākara. All the remaining characters come to an agreement that Digambara shall marry Danturā and Sabhāsali shall marry Madanamanjari. Ṣaturvēdi enters to fix the 'Muhūrta'. He selects a 'Muhūrta' that may result in the widowhood of Danturā. Digambara and Ṣaturvēdi enter into a quarrel in connection with the gift offered to Ṣaturvēdi.

Śankhadhara seems to be very cautious in naming the two acts as Lajjāvikraya a and Danturā Pariṇaya respectively. Danturā, the whore has no shame at all and therefore the word Lajjāvikraya is not applicable to her. Then it is applicable to Digambara and Sabhāsali

who, being the renowned scholars and philosophers prepare to marry the prostitute. Thus, in the first act, Śankhadhara has made all the characters shameless and brought them together in the second act. But logically, Danturā and Madanamanjari, the whores by profession, appear better than the other hypocrites.

All the characters and their names are ridiculous but significant. Almost all the persons, who have close connections with the society and are supposed to be the well-wishers of it, have degraded themselves. Negligence of social duties victimises a man more than that of personal duties. Being a part and parcel of the society with certain prestige and dignity, one should be devoted to one's own duties. In this farce, a scholar, a physician, a Jain monk and Ḳapālika, a head of a village, a Vedic scholar, an expert in *Darsanas*, a Buddhist and an astrologer shamelessly quarrel over a prostitute. All these people are, in fact, supposed to lead and guide the society. But they behave like an eyelid that bite the eye instead of saving it. Therefore, Sankhadhara comes forth and takes the responsibility of moralising them by laughing at them, satirising over their follies and pointing out their vices. Sankhadhara has not differed from other writers in naming his characters according to their nature and behaviour to ridicule and deride them like Jantukētu, Ajnānarāśi, Sangrāmavisara, Vyasanākara, Viśwasaghātuka etc.,

Neither the chronological development of the plot, nor the reasonable progress of the character is seen in most of the farces, of which, Laṭakamēlaka is no exception. So, the nourishment of *Hāsya* mainly depends upon the situations served by the characters.

Description of the wicked, and their physical appearances especially the description of aged prostitutes are ubiquitously portrayed in this farce like other farces.

भुजङ्ग दंश व्यसनाकुलाया दन्ता बहिर्गा इव बन्धुरायाः ।
वन्धानुसन्धानपरा यदीया पार्श्वे समाकर्षति कर्णपाली ॥

Sankhadhara has a good imagination too, which he shuffles with comic and simplicity and presents a description Danturā, as follows.

अन्तर्निमग्नं नयनद्वयेन
क्वचित्प्रयातं नवयौवनेन ।
भग्नौ कपलौ पतितं कुचाभ्यां
मन्ये भयान्मन्मथसायकानाम् ॥

Sankhadhara uses to introduce the characteristics of each and every character before bringing them on to stage. He presents them with wit and humour. At one stage he picturises a conflict between Sabhāsali and his wife Kalahapriyā, similar that of a cat and dog. Let us read the description of it as done by Kulavyādhi, the disciple of Sabhāsali.

अये! दन्तुरे । अद्यैव कलहप्रियया सममेतेषां दशनादशनि नखानखि कर चरण निर्वन्ध भीषणो महाहव स्संवृत्तः । ततो दर्वीखण्डेन ततोऽलातखण्डेन ततः पीठिकया ततो हण्डिकया एष उपाध्यायः हत्वा निस्सारितः ॥

This is a fragmentary phase of the domestic comedy. But at the time of producing it, a clever actor can easily evoke laughter. We must remember that movement in comic, in any drama depends mostly upon the talent of the director. The writer has little to do with it.

The comic based on discourses, jokes, certain figures of speech, a few surprises, puns, boastings, pejorative tendencies, philosophical mockery etc., pervades throughout the play. Danturā and Madanamanjari are whores and therefore the love of their 'customers' for them, is nothing but *Rasābhāsa*. Jokes against Danturā are merely laughable. At the end, the two ill matched couples i.e. Digambara and Danturā and Sabhāsali and Madanamanjari provoke laughter by suppressing decorum.

We often see boasts in *Prahasanas*. For instance, see the introduction of Mithyāśukla.

परधन निविष्ट दृष्टिः मिथ्याशुक्लस्तमोमयो जगति ।
सित दशन किरणधोरणि धौत दिगन्तः परिस्फुरति ॥

अपि च -

ब्रह्मण्य दर्प परिमृष्ट विरिचिलीलः
शम्भोरपि व्रतविधा वुपहासशीलः ।
कूपाम्बुधौत कपिलाम्बर वेपवर्ती
दम्भप्रियः स्फुरति वञ्चक चक्रवर्ती ॥

In the second verse, the first three lines seem as if they are elevating Mithyāśukla but soon after going through the fourth line, we laugh at him for being called as Vançaka Çakravarti, the emperor among the cheats. Each and every evil practising - person is introduced in the same manner.

The character of Jantukētu strengthens the Prahasana and it is of vital importance in the evolution of comic sentiment. All the later physicians in *Prahasanas* no doubt, are the images of Jantukētu. He betrays the essence of his foolishness like this.

व्याधयो मदुपचार लालिताः मत्प्रयुक्तममृतं विषं भवेत् ।
किं भयेन सरूजां किमौषधैः जीवहर्तरि पुरःस्थिते मयि ॥

Not only his dialogues but also the modus operandi - of his treatment is ridiculous. For instance, read the following-

यस्य कस्य तरोर्मूलं येन केनापि योजयेत् ।
यस्मै कस्मै प्रदातव्यं यद्वा तद्वा भविष्यति ॥

Now let us examine some of the comic types based on the sparkling words or figures of speech. See a discourse among Sabhāsali, Jantukētu and Kulavyādhi.

सभा :- अद्येह हट्टे रोदन कल कल स्संवृत्तः । तत् किं भवदुपचारः सञ्जातः ?

जन्तु :- न हि न हि । भवद्भिरेव यदि स्वस्त्ययनं कृतं स्यात्

सभा :- न हि न हि

कुल :- आर्यौ! यदि युवां द्वावपि तत्र न गतौ तत् किं वज्रेन मारितो वणिक्तनयः?

This joke is simple but nice. Kulavyādhi, in a simple statement, has rightly estimated the worth of both Sabhāsali and Jantukētu. When Danturā has been attacked by hypermetropia Jantukētu goes to treat her. See their conversation here:

जन्तु :- किय दूरं पश्यसि

दन्तुराँ :- वटवृक्षं यावत्

जन्तु :- अत्र वटवृक्षोऽपि अस्ति किम् ?

Who is the patient here and who is the doctor? After fixing the marriage of Digambara with Danturā the comic element takes a new stride and provokes Ćaturvēdi who fixes a muhurta as-

ज्येष्ठा नक्षत्रे शनैश्चराधिष्ठिते धनुषि लग्ने युक्तस्यात् अनयोर्विवाहः

At once Sabhāsali objects but Ćaturvēdi supports himself with a false reasoning as

उपरितन भागे यदा वैधव्यं तदा को दोषः

A fantastic joke of Ćaturvēdi lies in the blessing of the newly wedded couple, which is a verse from Bhagavadgītā and is very much amusing.

जातस्य हि धुवो मृत्युः ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च ।
तस्मादपरिहार्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितु मर्हसि ॥

Sabhāsali offers two villages to Danturā and Digambara. Then a discourse between Sabhāsali and Ćaturvēdi delights us for its ill-decorum.

चतुर्वेदी :- भो भो उपाध्याय ! यावदावाभ्यां लीलागारे रति र्न दीयते तावत् कुतो यौतुक कौतुकम् ।

सभा :- एतयोरत्र कौतुकागारे महाशय्या कियताम् । यो यत्र म्रियते तस्य तत्रैव दाहो युक्तः

The subject of funeral is totally out of place there, but Sabhāsali compares it with the marriage of Danturā and Digambara.

Thus, Laṭakamēlaka has its shape as a fine Farce. The fervent aims of Sankhadhara in purifying and moralising the contemporary

society are successful. The interpretation of various theories of great prophets by these foolish people is sympathetic on one hand and foolish on the other. If the descriptions of Madanamanjari are lessened, Laṭakamēlaka will be a beautiful satire.

BHAGAVADAJJUKAM

Singabhūpāla in Nāṭaka Paribhāṣā refers to Bhagavadajjuka Prahasana of Bodhayana in the category of '*Suddha*' in the types of *Prahasana*.[4] Nothing is determined so far about the period of Bodhayana. Some critics believe that Bhagavadajjuka is prior to Mattavilāsa Prahasana of Mahendra Vikrama Varma of 6th Century A D. But some others place it around 12th century.

In the prelude, *Sūtradhāra* takes the assistance of *Vidūṣaka* and establishes that the Prahasana is an important type of drama among the ten types of Sanskrit *Rūpakas,* which is hardly acceptable.

नाटक प्रकरणोद्भवेषु पारेहामृगडिम समवाकार व्यायोग भाणसंलापक वीथ्युत्सृष्टिकाङ्क प्रहासनादिषु नाट्य रसेषु हास्यमेव प्रधान मिति पश्यामि । तस्मात्प्रहसनमेव प्रयोक्ष्यामि

The play begins with the entrance of an ascetic and his disciple, Ṡāṇḍilya who discuss about the importance of the theory and the practice of Indian Philosophy. The ascetic replies many a question of Ṡāṇḍilya. Fortunately, this ascetic is not disguised but genuine and therefore is very strange to *Prahasana* readers. All the ascetics in other *Prahasanas* are imposters. But Ṡāṇḍilya who just wants to make a living is similar to other disciples in other *Prahasanas*. He becomes the disciple of Parivrājaka for the square meal and therefore he begins to argue with his teacher unnecessarily, which results in the comic. This is a one-act play containing the unity of place and time. But at the end of the conversation of these two characters, we can put a full stop and call it, the first act.

Variation in the narration of *Hāsya* of Bodhayana invites the attention of the reader or spectator. One has to comprehend the mind

of the playwright in evolving the *Hāsya* in this regard. In farces like Laṭakamēlaka, Hāsyārṇava Prahasana etc., the vulgar personalities disguised as noble characters such as ascetics, saints etc., or the sublime characters falling of their nobility, causes mirth. But I think, Bodhayana might have created Parivrajaka to remove the stigma attached to ascetics in *Prahasanas*. Former farces were not accepted or enjoyed by elite audience. But Bodhayana's 'Bhagavadajjuka' was both reasonable and acceptable even to scholars.

The second part of the play begins with the entrance of Vasantasēna, a prostitute. The scene takes place in a garden. Vasantasēna, sings some songs which influence Ṡāṇḍilya who was there with his teacher. Ṡāṇḍilya wants to congratulate and bow down before Vasantasēna, but Parivrājaka does not allow him. Then enters an assistant of Yama to take away the life of Vasantasēna, by order of his master. Waiting for a chance, he transfers himself into a serpent and bites Vasantasēna. As Vasantasēna falls down Ṡāṇḍilya laments bitterly as if he has lost everything. He touches her disobeying his teacher's warning. To convince Ṡāṇḍilya, proving the greatness of Indian Philosophy and Yogasaastra practically, Parivrājaka leaves his body and enters the dead body of Vasantasēna. (*Parakāya Pravesa*). The lady wakes up and acts as if she were a prophet. Being afraid of her, they call for a physician, who runs away after looking at the patient.

Meanwhile, realising his mistake in killing Vasantasēna instead of some other person, the Yamabhata comes to correct himself, by making Vasantasēna alive. Looking at the things there, the emissary of Yama fills in the body of Parivrajaka with the soul of Vasantasēna. He gets up and behaves like a prostitute. Then Ṡāṇḍilya rightly explains

नैव भगवान् नैव अज्जुका अथवा भगवदज्जुकं नामेदं सवृत्तम्

After a while, with the co-operation of Parivrājaka, the Yamabhata sets things aright.

Fiction showing imagination of a high order, a unique and strong plot construction, simple unadorned scenes full of wit and humour, portrayal of characters from life and above all originality and sincerity are the vital forces to nourish the comic.

Unlike other farces, Bhagavadajjuka has not given up its nobility It can be performed anywhere, and at any time. There is nothing indecent in the play. Though Sṛngāra, Karuna, etc., appear false, *Hāsya* is pure and simple and does not lead to hatred.

The character of a physician has been common in any farce whether necessary or not, but in the case of Bhagavadajjuka, the appearance of a physician is made necessary and proper. His features completely differ from his fellow-physicians in other farces. His homilies and efforts in treating Vasantasēna, incorporated with the soul of Parivrājaka do not yield much result but his presence is very impressive and attractive. He talks nonsense but it doesn't seem vulgar. He is fond of humour than wit. Let us go through a fantastic discourse in connection with his treatment.

गणिका :- ब्रूहि ब्रूहि वैद्य शास्त्रम्

वैद्य :- शृणोतु भवती
वातिकाः पैत्तिका श्चैव श्लै श्लै श्लै...
अपिहा पुस्तकं पुस्तकम् ।

शाण्डिल्य:-अहो ! वैद्यस्याभिरूपता । एकपदे विस्मृतः । भवतु मम वयस्य एव । इदं पुस्तकम्

वैद्य :- श्रृणोतु भवती ।
वातिकाः पैत्तिका श्चैव श्लैष्मिकाश्च महाविषाः ।
त्रीणि सर्पा भवन्त्येते चतुर्थी नाधिगम्यते ॥

गणिका:- अयमपशब्दः त्रयस्सर्पा इति वक्तव्यम् । त्रीणि नपुंसकं भवति ।

वैद्य :- अपिहा वैयाकरण सर्पेण खादिता भवेत् ॥

This is really a superb comic, developed on the basis of humour. No doubt, Bodhayana has had exalted himself after completing this

scene as well as the entire farce. The timely disclosure of the physician like वैयाकरण सर्पेण खादिता भवेत् is remarkable in particular.

Śāṇḍilya is the chief character in this Prahasana. He provides lively entertainment to the audience. Both Parivrājaka and the prostitute appear very gentle, and Śāṇḍilya, takes over the charge of the theatre completely. The comic evoked by the hermit and the prostitute after exchanging their souls is the result of a particular situation, not of character. Starting with his discourses and reasonable arguments from the very beginning of the play Śāṇḍilya goes on tickling the hearts of the spectators to the end. He becomes a Buddhist saint, just for the sake of his breakfast, that too with a bad result. He at once, changes again and becomes a refugee. Changing opinions for the sake of food looks ridiculous, and funny. Yet he is frank and never has given up truth. See his statement-

न मामकोऽस्ति न भ्रातृको वा पिता कुतो मे भगवत्प्रसादः ।
एकोहमन्न हतत्वेन (?) यतिं प्रविष्टो न तु धर्मलोभात् ॥

His arguments with his teacher being false are very amusing. After hearing the following preaching of Parivrājaka

as-

सुखेषु दुःखेषु च तुल्यरूपतां भयेषु हर्षेषु च नातिरिक्तताम् ।
सुहृत्स्वमित्रेषु च भावतुल्यतां वदन्ति तां तत्वविदो ह्यसङ्गतिम् ॥

he at once rises to the occasion and questions as

यद्यहमध्येमि नाध्येमि वा किन्तव मुक्तस्य

and therefore, he should not be angry with him. When his teacher wishes to enter a garden and take rest, he promptly attends to him and says

ननु समसुखदुःखः किल भवान्

But these are only Prima-facies which, through Parivrājaka, Bodhayana replies and condemns.

After Vasantasēnā's death, the pathetic and the erotic, movements of Śāṇḍilya are recreating. But even at that time, the prophet behaves without any compromise. He encourages Śāṇḍilya to study his routine course. No doubt, this is improper and Śāṇḍilya also correctly feels the same and calls his teacher bad names-

आः आकुलाकुलोऽस्मि । शीर्षपादं न जानामि । एतौ ताल फल प्रमाणौ पीनौ कालेय चन्दनालिप्तौ स्तनावधो मृखौ तत्र भवत्याः अधन्यस्य मम जीवत्या अनासादितौ ।

Śāṇḍilya's lament doesn't show sympathy. In the extremity of his foolishness, after witnessing the death of his teacher, he says-

एवं बहु जानन्तोऽपि म्रियन्ते नाम

Thus, Śāṇḍilya derives wit even from foolish situations and entertains the audience throughout the performance.

Thus, this farce with rich humour and fun, deserves a place among the great playlets. Besides nourishing a delightful comedy, Bodhayana endeavoured to bridge the gap in the flow of Indian literature and yogasastra.

HĀSYAÇŪḌĀMAṆI PRAHASANAM

Hāsyaçūḍāmaṇi, a delicious farce has set a good example among lovely farces. It appeals to the mediocre as well as to the elite. Vatsarāja, a minister in the court of Paramarthidēva of 13th century A. D. is the author of this farce. He wrote many types of dramas. His works retain originality, delicacy of feeling and high spirit in evolving comic regarding style, context, thought and information. The modesty, idealism and the comic in this farce are of high rank and reflect the culture and civilisation of India.

The Plot of this Prahasana is fictitious, fully devoted to the development of comic. Kapaṭakēli is a bawd. Her daughter loves Kalākaraṇḍaka, a gambler, and wants to marry him. Kapaṭakēli refuses. Kōkilā and Pārāvata are the assistants of Kalākaraṇḍaka. Jnānarāśi, an astrologer on whom the farce depends, is the advocate of Kalākaraṇḍaka. He has a disciple, Kauṇḍinya. With this background

Hāsyaçūḍāmaṇi brings out lively humour that grips the audience. Kapatakēli, the bawd is robbed of all her property one night by some miscreants. She suspects her daughter and her companions Kalākaraṇḍaka and his followers. She wants to approach Jnānarāśi, the astrologer to find out who the thieves and starts with her servant, Mudgaraka. At that time Jnānarāśi instructing Kauṇḍinya, his pupil. Kauṇḍinya is a clever boy not interested in studies and even makes fun of his teacher. Jnānarāśi and Kauṇḍinya appear so intimate that they swear at each other in one moment, and are chums in the next; especially before strangers. After hearing Kapaṭakēli, the astrologer predicts something after painful efforts and sends her back home.

In the second act, Jnānarāśi enters a garden with his disciple. They happen to see Madanasundari waiting for Kalākaraṇḍaka. with her servant maid. Both Jnānarāśi and Kauṇḍinya are anxious to enjoy the beauty of Madanasundari, but they try to hide it from each other. Jnānarāśi, stricken by love want to subjugate Madanasundari with the power of incantation. He arranges everything with the co-operation of Kauṇḍinya. At the end, Kauṇḍinya wipes the name of Madanasundari on the leaf, and writes the name of Kapatakēli. Hiding himself, he awaits the consequences.

Then to his surprise, Kapatakēli being deeply in love with Jnānarāśi enters showering love on him. The astrologer becomes furious, but the lady doesn't move. As he tries to test her, Kokila and Pārāvata, vexed with his behaviour enter the scene, to take revenge on the astrologer.

Jnānarāśi requests Kapatakēli to save him and she agrees ignoring her, Kokila and Pārāvata lift Jnānarāśi up to throw him into fire. But clever Kaundinya tempts them by praising the mastership of Jnānarāśi in finding out hidden treasures. They bow down before Jnānarāśi and pray to him to make them rich. Jnānarāśi prepares collyrium with the leaves of the plant called Langali' (Gloriosa Superba) and applies it on their eyes to search the hidden treasures. They suffer a lot and return the same punishment to the teacher and

his student. Then enters Kalākaraṇḍaka, the hero, and saves them by prescribing remedies as suggested by his advocate Jnānarāśi and then explains them the greatness of Jnānarāśi.

Jnānarāśi and his disciple Kaunḍinya are the key characters in this farce in the evolution of comic. Every movement of them evokes comic. We doubt the scholarship of Jnānarāśi in astrology, until the last moment, Kalākaraṇḍaka approves it. We doubt the success of his incantation, but Kapaṭakēli proves his worth. We have to conclude that Jnānarāśi is a scholar both in astrology and in the occult but a stupid in utilising his talents. His follies make him useless and invalid. Thus, Jnānarāśi unfortunately is capable but inefficient. He has inherited these qualities from his ancestors. See the miserable position of Jnānarāśi and his family.

दिव्ये शुद्धिकृता व्यलीक कथनाच्चोरेण तातो हतो
भ्राता में विननाश काल फणिना दष्टो निधानं खनन्।
युद्धज्ञान विपर्ययान्नृपतिना हन्तुं समाकाङ्क्षितो
जातोऽहं भगवानियं कुलरिपुर्विद्याहि नः केवली ॥

Their family had been unaware of the fact that small splinters kindle a big fire, while big logs put out the fire. As a piece from the same cloth. Jnānarāśi's instruction to Kaunḍinya is ridiculous. Many conversations between Jnānarāśi and Kaunḍinya are non-sequiturs and therefore delighting. Please follow a discourse.

ज्ञान :- अयि कण्ठगतौ श्लोकौ तवेमौ संवृत्तौ

कौ :- ज्ञानराशे ! उदरगताविमौ संवृत्तौ

ज्ञान :- मूर्ख ! नामग्रहणेन मां व्याहरसि ।

कौ :- किन्तव नामग्रहणेन पापं भवति ?

ज्ञान :- धिङ् मूर्ख ! न गृह्यते गुरूणां नाम

कौ :- तत्कथं शैलानां नाम गृह्यते ।

As he was unable to repeat the spelling taught by his teacher, Kaunḍinya disinterested in studies, requests his master to teach him astrology, so that he can earn money from poor people. However, Jnānarāśi's attempts to keep him away from the study of astrology prove in vain. As Kaunḍinya is firm in his decision, Jnānarāśi starts his lessons with two expedient statements that deceive the customers. They are comic-oriented and quite amusing.

कि वाग्भिर्निकषो हि नः फल मिति स्यादूढगर्वग्रहः
प्रश्नेष्वाविल मुत्तरं विरचयेन्न व्याहरे न्निर्णयम् ।
सिद्धं कार्यमवेक्ष्य निश्चित मिदं पूर्वं मयासीदिति
स्फारं स्फारमुदीरयेदुपचरेत्कञ्चिन्मृषा साक्षिणम् ॥

Here is the way to predict the positive result. And when it, fails, here is the other way out to escape.

चिन्ता चुम्बित चेतसा न रचितः प्रश्नः प्रशस्त स्त्वया
नूनं सम्यगुपशृतिर्न भवता ज्ञाता ग्रहीतुं तदा ।
त्वद्दोषेण फले भ्रमोऽयमभवद्विद्या हि नः केवली
कल्पान्तेऽपि न कम्पते जनमिति प्रत्याययेद्वञ्चितम्

At this juncture, Kapatakēli enters. At first, he simulates apathy in such cases but latter he sheds his pretence. He prepares horoscopes and speaks out something. Let us see the continuity of the scene, in the discourse of the two cheats, the teacher and his student.

ज्ञान :- (लिखनाभिनयं कृत्वा) कौण्डिन्य! कवर्गीयोयं वकारः

कौ :- अहं पुन स्सवर्गीयं जानामि

ज्ञान :- तदस्य कति मात्राः ?

कौ :- पञ्च

ज्ञान :- अनुस्वारस्य कति भवन्ति ?

कौ :- यावत्यः लिखितुं पारयसि

ज्ञान :- त्रयोदश तावत्। अथ त्रयोदशभिः पञ्चभिश्च द्वाविंशतिः।

कौ:- न हि न हि विशतिर्भवति।

कपट :- ननु अष्टादश भवन्ति। गणयत्वार्यः।

ज्ञान :- (स्वगतं विभाव्य) अये! गणित दुर्विदग्धेयम् तद्यथा तथा तावत्समापयामि। (प्रकाशम्) भद्रे! अन्य एवास्मदीय गणना सम्प्रदायः

Despite their foolishness and incoherent speeches, they deserve applause for their timely wit and self-confidence. Their absurdity draws laughter from the audience. Jnānarāśi's prediction is logical, based on common sense, simple and psychological defects of human beings. Their miserable failures offer wonderful delight to the spectators. He asks the names of all the family members of Kapatakēli to find out the thief. Obeying his mistress, Mudgaraka gives the full details of the family, beginning with Kapatakēli. Then Jnānarāśi applies his logic to it and suspects Kapatakēli as her name tops the list of the suspected as told by Mudgaraka and reveals the same in the following manner.

कपटकेलिः सुष्ठु चौर्येण शङ्कनीयेति प्रथममेव उदाहृता। तदेना मेव कथयामि। (गणिताभिनयं कृत्वा, प्रकाशम्) कपटकेलिस्तावत्कृतचौर्या प्रतिभासते।

In spite of it, the spark in his thought once again saves him. Kaunḍinya too does his best to save his master at times.

As Jnānarāśi and Kaunḍinya are talented academicians, the former confesses his folly at times and does not hesitate to stand corrected.

Moreover, he is weaker than Kaunḍinya. Jnānarāśi never exposes himself, but Kaunḍinya weakens his master directly, feigning reverence. After seeing Madanasundarī embracing her servant maid, Kaunḍinya is irritated and rebukes his master and his penance like this.

उपाध्याय! दह्यतु एतदस्माकं तपः। प्रेक्षस्व प्रक्षस्व एतस्याः धन्यत्वं यन्मदनसुन्दर्या समालिङ्ग्यते

Jnānarāśi listens to him and feels happy but acts as if he is going to curse Kaunḍinya. Then Kaunḍinya ridicules like.

किमकारणं कमण्डलु जलं प्रवाह्यसि । क्लमिष्यसि मध्याह्न तृष्णया । जानामि तव प्रभावम्

Even after getting this mockery Jnānarāśi keeps silent because of his bad conduct. Kaunḍinya here, derides not only Jnānarāśi but all teachers that are evil practitioners and of evil character in this society.

Afterwards Jnānarāśi, Kaunḍinya and Kapatakēli hold the responsibility of recreating the theatre. The scene, when Kapatakēli comes to meet Jnānarāśi, influenced by the incantation of Jnānarāśi, amended by Kaunḍinya, is highly remarkable and laughable. As Kapatakēli fails to convince Jnānarāśi, she tries to teach him some principles of the god of Love i.e., Kamadeva. For instance, read the following Epigram.

भगवान् कुरूते नित्यं यः कन्दर्प निषेवणम् ।
सुतरां प्रीतये तस्मै कन्दर्पजनको हरिः ॥

But there is no positive result. Then Kapatakēli begins to quarrel with Jnānarāśi which results in the exaggerated comic of action.

Vatsarāja doesn't keep silent after developing the comic-oriented nature in the characters, but tries his best to promote the nourishment of comic through simple ideas and words also. Kaunḍinya always utilises his master as readymade simile for everything like-

अत्र माधवीमण्टपे अद्भुता कापि स्त्री उपाध्याय इव ध्यान परायणा तिष्ठति -

त्वमिव दुविषह तीव्रतेजाः दिननाथः ।

Thus, by all means, Haasyacudaamani prahasana is a valuable, admirable and unique contribution of Vatsarāja to Sanskrit drama as well as to the entire literature

GAURIDIGAMBARA PRAHASANAM

This is the work of Sankara Misra of 14th century A.D. But the authorship of the prologue is attributed to Bhavanatha Misra, father of Sankara Misra. Bhavanatha Misra composed a verse to entertain his son, while he was a child. Later Bhavanatha Misra gave it to his son, advising him to write a *Prahasana* using that verse as prologue.

This farce belongs to "*Suddha*" type according to Sanskrit critics. Digambara is the hero of this play who is Dhṛṣṭa according to Sanskrit rhetorics. Sankara Misra has concentrated only on building up the plot, with absurdity and incongruity in the development of the plot. The imaginary plot and its farcical treatment are themselves laughable.

Digambara (the Nude) is one of the several names of Lord Siva. But no poet had used that name with its actual meaning. Everyone describes him as having dressed in tiger skin. But in the present farce, nudity of Siva taken into account and the entire play is mainly based on it. Description of nudity may be vulgar to some extent, but Sankara Misra has successfully kept the readers interested in the farce, ignoring the nudity of Siva. Moreover, the vulgarity in its treatment is in a low-tone and therefore no spectator has found it obscene. On the other hand, his imagination of nudity philosophically proves the infinity of Siva which is beyond the common man's thought. Though this Prahasana appears as farce on the surface, but in-depth, is a good application of the philosophy Siva

Mynāka comes to Siva to fix his sister's (Gauri's) marriage with Digambara, when Digambara had been playing with the naked ghosts. Wishing to conceal their master's disposition, Nandi and Bhṛñgirita tell Mynāka that Siva is talking to Kubera in the inner-chamber. But at the very minute, the naked Siva enters. This situation results in the 'sudden glory' (*Vikāsa*) in the audience. At his wits end Nandi introduces Siva to Mynāka. Mynāka regrets, thinking as कौपीनमात्रमपि दुर्लभमस्य etc, refuses to offer his sister. By all

means Digambara prays to him not to be angry. But Mynāka leaves the place disgusted, and Siva follows him with his fellow-ghosts.

However, matrimony of Digambara with Gauri is settled, and Lord Brahman accepts to be the priest. Siva refuses to give his family particulars to Brahman. For everything he replies no'. Nandi and Nārada differ with each other in deciding whether the marriage is "*Gāndharva*" or "*Brāhma*", Nārada calling it "*Gāndharva*" and Nandi opposing it. At the time of celebrating the marriage Siva, wantonly creates a series of problems. He says that he belongs to *Himavat sagotra*. Later on he declares that he does not belong to any lineage. Over and above he suggests that the mountain Himālaya also has not got any particular lineage. Any how *Himālaya* accepts, and Siva marries Gauri.

The disparity shown between the two i.e., the actual appearance of Siva and the appearance expected by Mynāka is very amusing. Digambara is also laughable for his appeal to Mynāka to get his sister married to him. Mynāka calls Siva bad names, but no one is against him for Siva appears worse than what he calls him. See the scene and discourse where Mynāka rejects Siva.

मैनाक :- अये ! प्रतीहार ! महेश्वरोऽन्तःपुरमधितिष्ठतीति इदानी मपि प्रतारणैवेयम् ?

नन्दी :- आर्य ! न जानासि प्रतारण बहुलैव वैवाहिकी कथा ।
कथमन्यथा दिगम्बरस्य विवाहः सम्भावना पथमवतरेत् ॥

मैनाक :- तर्हि वयमेव प्रतारण पात्रम् । (अञ्जलिं बध्व) दिगम्बर! वर्धस्व! वयं गृहाय गच्छामः

दिग :- (मैनाकं हस्ते गृहीत्वा परावृत्य) अये! गौरी सहोदर! अये गिरिजा सोदर्य! अये पार्वती सगर्भ्य! अये हिमवत्तनूज! अये मैनाक!! न वय मुपेक्षा मर्हामः । सर्वथा शीतलप्रकृतेः हिमवतः खलु पुत्रस्त्वम् । कथमस्मान् सन्तापयसि । विपक्षस्तव पिता । त्वं पुत्रः सपक्ष एव । तत्सर्वथा कारुण्येन वर्तितुमर्हसि ।

Nandi supports the deceitful nature of himself for the sake of Digambara and his marriage with Gauri which degrades Digambara. Digambara's prayers to Mynāka with puns and repetitions as said

above are ridiculous. By this he degrades himself without any feeling. Finally Mynāka concludes like this -

विषम लोचन लोचन हीनया
यदि वृतोसि तया लघुचित्तया ।
तदपि सा भवते न वितीर्यते
न हि सिता करभाय निवेद्यते ॥

The scene of celebrating the marriage of Siva with Gauri and the behaviour of Siva therein, is very attractive and enlivening. Lord Brahman wants to perform 'Sūtradhāraṇa' first and conclude with the rest later. But Siva wants it on reverse. He wears the holy clothes (*Madhuparka*) offered by *Himālaya* to cover up the plaits of his hair. Being irritated by this, Brahman throws away the book in his hand. The funny part of this scene is in keeping the book of chants, in the hands of Brahman, who is fluent in reciting four *Vedas*. Brahman wants Siva to reveal his lineage for which Siva replies-

न पिता न पितामहो न गोत्रं प्रवराणामपि नाम न प्रतीमः।
तनुरीदृगियञ्च मे गतिर्गतिरेषैव च सर्वमङ्गला ॥

Brahman once again becomes displeased with Siva's behaviour. When *Himālaya* expresses his lineage as *Kāśyapa*, Siva also at once says that his lineage is also *Kāśyapa*. Thus, Siva appears all ready for a conflict. After the completion of the marriage function two ghosts flee away carrying Sumangali, a servant maid of Gauri. However, Siva, in this scene, appears adamant and wants to succeed in everything in spite of his flaws to be a bridegroom. This obstinacy is the only quality that leads this character throughout this farce. But seen through the divine eyes or thought, it exactly proves the all-knowing and all-pervading and Omnipotent nature of Lord Siva.

On the other hand, it directly examines the stability, confidence and practice of the Indian Philosophy with *Bhakti* as its main virtue. All the deities in Indian mythology are considered superior to ordinary human beings in the abilities and knowledge. Those qualities, appear to a common man as impossible or absurd. Siva is called Digambara and Sarvajna. Both the names are used is worshipping him.

But if the phenomenon as attributed by us comes before our eyes, we are unable to tolerate it. Not only we, but even the Lord Brahman and Mynāka are unable to tolerate Siva's pranks over with those divine qualities. Therefore, the extra-ordinary qualities of Gods, the wise and the great worshipped, praised and glorified need not necessarily be tolerated by people. Even in the contemporary society, we see many scholars looking like fools. It is our folly that prompts to laugh at them. The same theory applies in this farce also. We laugh at Siva because we are ordinary people, ignorant of what the Lord is.

Here, we may apply the theory of Catharsis (Purgation) of Aristotle. Laughter aroused by witnessing the deeds of Digambara purifies our hearts. After purification we recognise the Omnipotence and divinity of Siva and Gauri and bow down to them.

HĀSYĀRNAVA PRAHASHNAM

Hāsyārṇava Prahasana is a farce of Jagadisa Bhattacharya composed in two acts. This *Prahasana* looks like an enlargement of Laṭakamēlaka of Sankhadhara

King Anayasindhu is the hero in this farce. He was extravagant and luxurious and surrendered to lust. He has gone out of way and neglected his duties completely. Ayathārthavādi is his follower Ayathārthavādi gives a full picture of his people who are devoted to their duties, but this results in the anger of the King who is an obstinate block head. Anayasindhu and Ayathārthavādi leave for the residence of a prostitute namely, Bandhurā. Mṛgāñkalēkhā is the daughter of Bandhurā. After some time Viśvabhānḍa and his disciple Kalahāñkura enter on the stage. Kalahāñkura is in-charge of his master to bless his master's devotees. All his blessings appear improper and amusing. At this juncture Vyādhisindhu, a physician comes to treat Mṛgāñkalēkha suffering from a fish bone stuck in her throat. He tries his best to cure her but in vain.

Raktakallōla a barber, Mithyārṇava a companion of Viśvabhāṇḍa, Sādhuhimsaka, Raṇajambuka and Mahāyātrika who are regular visitors to the abode of that bawd, enter.

In the second act of the play, a gathering of Viśvabhāṇḍa, Kalahāñkura, Madanāndhamiśra with his disciple Kulāla, Mahānindakāçārya and Bandhurā and Mṛgāñkalēkha play their part. This gathering ends with the celebration of the marriages of Bandhurā with Kulāla and Kalahāñkura and Mṛgāñkalēkha with Viśvabhāṇḍa and Madanāndhamiśra respectively.

Anayasindhu, the very first character in this farce regrets to accept his people's good deeds. Without knowing what is good and what is bad, he misunderstands his people who are Virtuous in performing their duties. This shows the foolishness, arrogance and the evil nature of the king Anayasindhu. See the following stanza where in the actual position of his people, who have good qualities and noble ideas is described.

आलिङ्गन्ति निजाङ्गनां परवधूं हित्वा जनास्साप्रतं
नीचः सीव्यति सत्युपानहमहो सद्ब्राह्मणानां गणे ।
वन्दन्ते द्विजमन्त्यजे निवसति व्रीडाविहीना जना
एवं मण्डलवैपरीत्य मधुना जातं महाभूपते ॥

After listening to this, King Anayasindhu calls for his minister Kumativarma, whose name aptly suits his deeds. Kumativarma, after saluting the King with his left hand wants him to seek solace in the company of harlots and think over the displeasing behaviour of his people and to rectify it. That clever king admits it and leaves for the residence of Bandhurā with Kumativarma. Thus, the abode of harlots has become the spot where action of this *Prahasana* takes place.

False blessings are well advanced in this farce following the way of Śankhadhara in Laṭakamēlaka. In general, one who receives salutation has to bless youngers. But here in this farce one receives salutation and one's assistant has to bless. Viśvabhāṇḍa deputes his disciple Kalahāñkura to bless Anayasindhu. Read the following blessings -

नेत्र पुष्पोदयो भवतु भवताम्।
शत्रोर्वुद्धिर्भियो वृद्धिः वृद्धिर्व्याधेः ऋणैनसाम्।
दुर्गतेर्दुर्मतेः वृद्धिः सन्तु ते सप्त वृद्धयः॥

At the final stage of the *Prahasana* Mahānindaka holding the post of the priest on the eve of the matrimony of Bandhurā with Kulāla and Kalahāñkura chants like this-

ओम् श्मशानानलदग्धोऽसि परित्यक्तोऽसि बान्धवैः।
इदं क्षीरमिदं नीरं स्नात्वा पीत्वा सुखी भव॥

मरणं प्राणिनां नित्यं जीवनं स्वप्नवद्भुवि।
भवद्भिरिति विज्ञाय धर्तव्या नात्र योजना॥

पितृकानन मेदिन्यां महाशय्यानुयायिभिः।
सुचिरं स्थीयतां नित्यं महानिद्रावलम्बिभिः॥

This shows the absurd foolishness of Mahānindakāçārya and touches the humourous hearts. While mocking at the vile and evil nature of priests and physicians Jagadisa Bhattacharya follows the way of Sankhadhara. His priest Mahānindaka when he was setting a '*Muhūrta*' for the marriage of Danturā with Kulāla and Kalahāñkura comes out with his foolishness saying like this -

यत्र कुत्रापि लग्ने च वासरे यत्य कस्यचित्।
यत्र कुत्रापि नक्षत्रे यद्वा तद्वा विवीयताम्॥

This stanza is influenced by the verse यस्य कस्य तरोर्मूलम् etc, of Sankhadhara as quoted previously. This non-sense rightly proves the farcical stature of Mahānindaka which is helpful neither to him nor to his customers. Vyādhisindhu, the physician brings with him lots of fun and humour. Vyādhisindhu himself is a patient with many diseases, but he tries to cure all kinds of diseases of all his patients. His body is a treasure of ill-health. See his state as described by the author -

पानीयस्थूलपादे कथमपि धरया धारिते साङ्कुरौघे
हस्तन्यस्ताञ्चलाग्र प्रचलित पवनैर्वारयन् मक्षिकालीम्॥

कासात्कण्ठस्वनौघैः सपदि मुखरयन् दिङ्मुखं व्योमवीथी
मप्येष व्याधित्सिन्धुः प्रविशति सरुजा मन्तको राजवैद्यः ॥

His foolish statements[5] and boastings make us laugh at him. But at times he bursts out with his astonishing wit and forethought. His father has already died. But Viśvabhānda, to mock at his stupidity questions him as-

भो, व्याधिसिन्धो ! तव पितु रातुरान्तकस्य अन्तकालयप्राप्तस्य अपि कुशलम्

Vyādhisindhu at once replies to him as

कुतः कुशलं भवद्दर्शनं विना

This is the masterpiece of all the jokes of Vyādhisindhu as well as Jagadisa Bhattacharya. This repartee is a strong proof to ascertain that the Sanskrit playwrights are well aware of nourishing the polished comic in their works.

The combination of Viśvabhānda and his disciple Kalahāñkura is very interesting and suitable to this farce. Even Danturā, the harlot recognises the same and sounds as यथा उपाध्यायः शिष्योऽपि तथा । युक्तं भस्मपुञ्जे सारमेयावस्थानम्. Viśvabhānda is a great scholar minus common sense and propriety. His disciple Kalahāñkura is of the same type whose wits and jokes are of first rank, spiced with simple twists. At one stage, when Mṛgāñkalēkha scolds Viśvabhānda pointing out his old age, Kalahāñkura being unable to tolerate that supports his master in the following manner, only to make him fool for the second time.

यस्य निधुवनानुरक्ता ब्राह्मणी नक्तं दिवं विदग्धानां स्थाने बन्धनिवहं शिक्षमाणा अद्यापि भ्रमति, अतिस्नेहेन उपाध्यायपुरतः वैधव्य मण्डनं कृत्वा नित्य मनु मरणार्थं सुसज्जिता भवति तं वृद्धं जल्पसि। अपि च अद्यापि उपाध्यायः लज्जाकुलः वसनं परिहृत्य जनन्यङ्के शयनं करोति तं हतव्रीढं जल्पसि-

Jagadish Bhattacharya ridicules the traditional Vedic scholars at one stage, bringing Mithyārṇava, who takes bath only once in a year and who knows all the expiatory acts, on to the stage, to get a clarification from Viśvabhānda regarding the death of a Vedic Scholar. Mithyārṇava's searching for a "Śrōtriya" in the abodes of harlots is

by itself a sharp satire. It rightly points out the miserable plight of renowned scholars. But very soon Mithyārṇava reveals the secret in the death of the Vedic Scholar that the scholar was beaten to death by the crowd as he had illicit contacts with a washerwoman.

A bold bragging of Mahānindakāçārya in this farce is especially absurd and refreshing. At the end of his boastings he, driving himself to the mountain peaks says on as-

ब्रह्माण्डे ये द्विजास्सन्ति पाण्डित्येन बलेन वा ।
ते स्पर्धितुं मयासार्थं किञ्चदावर्जितोद्यमाः ॥

मया रचिता चत्वारो वेदाः -

Thus, the characters, their personalities, their names in accordance to their mentalities and the dual roles they play are moulded well in this farce. But this adept Jagadisa Bhattacharya at times treads the paths of vulgarity and impropriety. Of course, the Prahasana is a cheap drama with certain type of characters prescribed by critics. That doesn't mean that the writer and the reader should be cheap. The '*Śṛngāra*' in a farce, may be false but not vulgar. The characters may not control themselves, but the poet has to restrain his over-flowing emotions.

Jagadisa Bhattacharya, mixing anxiety with beautiful comic, suddenly turns vulgar which spoils the entire scene. It becomes less attractive. See one or two examples.

Kalahāñkura while describing Bandhurā says as-

स्तनी तुङ्गौ निपतितो काम सङ्ग्राम मर्दितौ ।
पुरस्तादवलोक्यास्याः भगं शुष्कं भयादिव ॥

When Viśvabhānda and Kalahāñkura, the teacher and the student quarrel for Mṛgāñkalēkha, the later abuses the former like this -

लिगिधातोरच् प्रत्यय मेलनेन यद्रूपं सिद्धं भवति तव तस्य उत्पाटनं युक्तं भवति ।

A comparison between the intercourse and a sacrifice seems very vulgar.[6] The Soliloquy of Viśvabhānda after fixing his student's

marriage with Bandurā is in the highest degree of vulgarity of Jagadisa Bhattacharya.[7] Apart from this vulgarity, Jagadisa Bhattacharya's work shows plenty of comic and fun.

KUKṢIMBHARA BHAIKṢAVA PRAHASANA

Kukṣimbharabhaikṣava is a farce compiled by Venkatappa of eighteenth century. It completely follows the traditional way of Prahasanas that had been followed by Laṭakamēlaka etc.,

Kukṣimbhara a Buddhistic ascetic and a mis-interpreter of Buddhism is the hero of this farce. One fine morning he comes across a whore Kāmakalikā and falls in love with her. Vakradanta, one of his disciples tries to facilitate the success of his master's love affair. Meanwhile Piçanḍikā, a servant maid of Kukkuri, the wife of Kukṣimbhara, comes over to the spot of Kukṣimbhara's secret romantic adventures. Vakradanta exposes all his master's love affairs. Piçanḍikā takes off and wants Kukkuri to warn Kukṣimbhara as Kāmakalikā is already in love with a '*Hūṇa*', who is irritated, may cut the ascetic's nose or pull out his eyes. But Kukṣimbhara does not pay heed to this advice.

Kukṣimbhara cannot forget Kāmakalika; at the same time he is afraid of his wife. To cure his master's illness Vakradanta brings him to a Buddhist temple. On their way Kukṣimbhara sees a young widow and teaches her some love lessons. thereafter he meets a '*Dāsari*' and a '*Jangama*' quarrelling over the authenticity of the philosophies of Vaiṣṇava and Ṡaiva and brings out a compromise between them. In addition to this, on his way to *Bauddhārāma* he mocks at *Ṡaktēyā, Jainism, Yōga Ṡāstra*, and the theory of *Çārvāka* pointing out many a defect in each and every philosophical motif of them.

Finally, Kukkuri comes on to the stage disguised as a foreign gentleman followed by her servant-maid Piçanḍikā, disguised as 'his' servant. Being compelled by these two disguised gentlemen, everyone victimises Jambuka, Piçanḍika beats him, who in turn shows his master.

At the very minute, the original foreigners enter and catch Kukkuri and Piçaṇḍika. Viḍālaka, one of the foreigners gets engaged to both Kukkuri and Piçaṇḍika. Lastly Kukṣimbhara makes up his mind and leaves the office of the Buddhistic temple to Vakradanta.

This farce consists of many peculiar types of characters only to satirize and moralise the follies and perversions in each and every religion like *Buddhism, Jainism, Śaktēya* etc., and various sects like *Yōgi, Dāsari, Jañgama*, *Çārvāka* etc., in general and in particular the plot is intended to point out the various defects of Buddhism. Therefore, the poet mocks at them and satirises them with sharp wit and abrupt irony.

Vidūṣaka helps the author to divide and depress the *Jains* and *Çārvākas*. When Digambara advises to give up anger Vidūṣaka requests him to be peaceful and beats him with a stick which results in his taking off. Then *Çārvāka* puts forth his philosophy as-

यभतु कामपि कञ्चन कन्यकां
पिबतु नित्यं सुधामधुरं मधु ।
अपि च खादतु मांसमलं मुदा
अपि च मूर्ख मदोचित सम्भ्रमैः ॥

But *Vidūṣaka* defeats *Çārvāka* by requesting him to give away his wife first of all and set an example.

Contextual comic is also interesting in this farce. Thinking too much about his love for Kāmakalika, Kukṣimbhara becomes unconscious. Then his attendants try several means to awake him. But Bhallūka one of the clever assistants treats him correctly by chanting the following verse in his ear-

उतिष्ठोत्तिष्ठ कर्मन्दिन् उपश्रुत्य भवादृशान् ।
समेत्य जीर्णशूर्पेण सन्ताडयति कुक्कुरी ॥

This type of humour is common in domestic comedies but strange in farces. The poet goes beyond his limits in exaggerating the action in a bid to amuse spectators. Beating each other with their shoes by *Dāsari* and *Jangama* and the removal of all the clothes of

Digambara on the stage are far-fetched. Moreover, the seducing and raping of the two women by Viḍālaka on the stage is condemnable.

Some other dialogues and descriptions are also laughable, but more regrettable for their impropriety.

परिणीय कलञ्जमधूमसारं परिधान स्तनुमायतस्तनाभ्याम् ।
उरसिस्फुटपञ्जरे जरत्याः शयितः सौख्यझरी परीप्लुतोऽसि ॥

… … …

पूजापात्रमभाणि यत्र सुभगस्तब्बालरण्डभगः

Despite all these vulgarities, the poet has done a good job by satirising various defects of several religions with sound reasoning. If the purpose of a farce is to purify the society no doubt, Venkatappa has succeeded in his task. Finally, here is an example of the poetic talent and imagination of the poet.

आमील्याक्षियुगं क्षणं न चलति ध्यानावधानादिव
त्रायश्वेति वदत्यथाश्रु विसृजत्युन्मादमोहादिव ।
आहारादि यथापुरं न तनुते वैराग्यभावादिव
प्रायेणाञ्चति चैत्यवन्दन विधिव्याजेन वीथीमपि ॥

There are some tens of farces in Sanskrit *Prahasanas* which almost all follow one and the same way in dealing with the farcical plots and characters. They may at times come out with variety only in the mode of expressions and the mood of descriptions. Even if we admit the theory of Ānandavardhana that there should be no repetition of the words and thoughts of poets, repetitions and co-incidence of the descriptions are seen very often in farces.

Even in the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries we find many farces, following the traditional rhetorics. But Śṛngāra nāradīya Prahasana of Mahalinga Sastry is a unique farce. Taking the story of *Yakṣarāja* from the thirty seventh sarga of Uttara Rāmāyaṇa and the story of the matrimony of Nārada from the eighteenth and twenty seventh chapters in the sixth Skandha of Dēvībhāgavata Mahalinga

Sastry composed this farce. The workmanship of Mahalinga Sastry, is dealt with elsewhere, with the other types of Dramas.

There are many farces in Sanskrit namely Kṣut Kṣēmīya Prahasana, Kautuka Sarvasva Prahasana. Kautuka Ratnākara Prahasana, Dhūrta Samāgama Prahasana, Adbhuta Taranga Prahasana, Prāsangika Prahasana, Ṣanḍānuranjana, Vinodaranga Prahasana, Sōmavallī Yōgānanda Prahasana Subhagānanda Prahasana, Nāṭavāta Prahasana, Ṣaura Ṣāturīya, Anañgadā Prahasana, Anukūla Gala Hastaka, Mañikāñcana Samanvaya, Kuhanā Bhaikṣava Prahasana etc., to enrich the Sanskrit drama.

There are some farces which are completely vulgar and obscene. They almost resemble today's pornographic literature.

Kālidāsa Prahasana is well known farce. It is also named as Prahasana, Lambōdara Prahasana, Veñkaṭēśa Prahasana and Bhānu Prabandha Prahasana and is attributed to Veñkatēśwara, but not the author of Unmattakavikalaśa Prahasana. Kalidasa has nothing to do with this work. This is called Lambōdara Prahasana as it begins with the verse लंबोदरस्य विगलत् etc., it is called Veñkaṭēśa Prahasana as the author is considered to be Venkatesa and Prahasana as it has no famous prefix. But there is no reason to call this as Bhānu Prabandha Prahasana or Kālidāsa Prahasana. Even in the concluding verse of these Prahasanas there is no change. Dr Rudradeva Tripathi in his introduction to Dhūrtanartaka quotes the verse as

भूपाः पुण्यपथे चरन्तु भवतु क्षेमं नृणां सर्वतः
कालेष्वोषधयः फलन्तु कवयः खेलन्तु राज्ञां प्रियाः ।
कौण्डिन्यान्वय मण्डनाय जनित श्री दक्षिणामूर्तिना
काव्यस्यास्य च वेङ्कटेश्वर कविः कर्ता चिरञ्जीवतु ॥

But the second half of the verse differs from the other published, in Kālidāsa Prahasana. See-

विप्रास्सन्त्वथ निर्भयाश्च विधवोद्वाहो जरीजृम्भतां
कामो येन पुमर्थ सार्थ सरणौ मूर्धाभिषिक्तो भवेत् ॥

In addition to, there is another edition of this Kālidāsa Prahasana with a rendering into Telugu and published in Telugu script by name "Kālidāsa Lambōdara Prahasanamulu". The translator exercised his liberty in translating it and has added Some more vulgar thoughts. The author came out only with his pen name as Hāsyakalānidhi.

S. Chinnaya, the publisher of the text "Kālidāsa Lambōdara Prahasanamulu" attributes this to Kālidāsa and says like this.

"King Bhoja has an abscess on his throat. Physicians have suggested hilarious laughter as remedy for its opening. To enable Bhoja to have a hearty laugh, Kalidasa composed this farce."

Any student of Sanskrit literature can laugh at this fiction rather than at the farce. It is already proved that Kālidāsa and Bhōja are not contemporaries. In addition to it, the internal evidence too denies the authorship of Kālidāsa. See the forward of Sri Utpala Venkata Narasimha Charya, to Kalidasa Prahasana published by Vavilla Rama Swamy Sastrulu and sons-

तत्तादृशमिद मभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलादीनां रचयितुः महाकवेः कालिदासस्य कृतिरिति केचित् विमर्शकाः मन्वते । नैतद्युज्यते । "शिष्या लक्ष्मण देशिकस्य सित मृत्पिण्डस्फुरन् मूर्तयः" इति, "दृश्यन्ते पुरतो हताञ्जलदृशो रामानुजीयाङ्गनाः "इति च विक्रमार्क सभालङ्कारमणेः कालिदासात् अर्वाचीनस्य श्री भगवद्रामानुजगुरोः नामग्रहणेन तस्मात् अर्वाचीनेनैव कविना अवश्यम् भाव्यत्वात् ।" "वस्त्युत्तम्भित तैलयत्रमुसल व्यामोह कृन्मेहनम्" "करे लग्नो दीर्घपृथुः मुखस्रुतरसः कस्यापि कामध्वजः" इत्यादि परश्शत ग्राम्य वचस्साहित्यात् तत्तादृक् कालिदास मधुरतर वचो विलास विरहाच्च-

After prologue and interlude, Jambuka a young Student enters on to the stage looking for Kāsara, his fellow student, to fetch water from the river nearby, for their teacher, Vakranāsayami. Kāsara appears sleeping at the threshold of the house of Alābūstanī, a courtesan. Kāsara has been babbling about the past story of receiving a kick from an ass. Jambuka listens to this and compels him to reveal the entire story. Incapable of keeping quiet he comes out with his worries, saying that his wife is in love with some other

man. Jambuka wants him to join *Kaulāçāra.* Kāsara exits and Dīrghadanta enters with baldhead. He gives an account of his unsuccessful efforts to have sexual dealings with his teacher's wife and their consequences. Then enters Vakranāsayami instructing other disciples. He consols Dīrghadanta and offers *Kaulāçāra* to Kāsara. Kāsara and Dīrghadanta become dear to each other, Kāsara presents his wife to Dīrghadanta for the time being.

Vakranāsayami leaves for spring festivals along with Jambuka. Then he picturises and praises the beauty of ladies belonging to different regions and castes like Vaishnavism, Madhva, Karnata etc., and criticises the Philosophy of Advaita. Meeting another saint, Vinayanidhi, Vakranāsayami witnesses the dance of Gṛdhni and requests Jambuka to arrange a meeting with her. They support. Jambuka enters the house of Vakranāsayami and begins to fulfil his sexual desires with his teacher's wife. Meanwhile people of the king arrest Vakranāsayami who looks like a monkey, tied in a gunny bag. At the end, all the characters appear without any calamity and depart. Though there is little humour in the imagination of the plot, in treatment the poet has made it as he can.

In this farce, there are two inseparable qualities. One is the maintenance and exposition of lust throughout the play, irritating the reader. Second is absurdity. There is also some sort of Vikṛti which causes mirth but is completely depressed by the indecent descriptions and the vulgar narration of *Sṛngāra*. Persons, who could enjoy absurdity irrespective of the obscene can laugh at this farce. But this may not be possible in all cases. Only a few can enjoy this sort of humour. When vulgarity overtakes absurdity and humour, it becomes despicable. Thus, this farce irritates the readers first and later repels them,

Here is an exaggeration with a light trace of polished humour.

वेश्मद्वारि रतोत्सवेषु लिखितुं या रङ्गवल्लयेतया
प्रक्रान्ता कुचयोद्वयं निपतितं व्यालम्बि लुम्पेदिति ।

पाश्वद्वन्द्वनिविष्टबालककरव्यामृष्टवक्षोजया
कर्तुं तां न तया तया ततगरुत्कङ्कस्थितिः स्मर्यते ।

Thus, this Prahasana is very revolting to one's taste to teach such a book. Every individual has to study this only in secrecy. It consists of neither a good plot nor refining wit but is stocked abundantly with vulgarity and indecency.

Fortunately, Kalidasa Prahasana has its followers also.

Indian culture generally aims at bringing out human weaknesses. However, there are certain *Prahasanas* which feed such mental disabilities to the readers. Unmattakavikalaśa Prahasana is one such *Prahasana.*

UNMATTAKAVIKALAŚA PRAHASANA

A spirited and prone poet, Unmatta is the hero of this play. The Phenomenon of his conduct is as follows-

दौर्जन्यस्य तपःफलं सुचरितस्योत्पातकेतुः कलेः
आवृत्ति र्दुरितस्य गर्भसदनं मोहस्य काष्ठा परा ।
तृष्णायाः परदेवताऽनृतगिरां सीमा खलश्रेयसा
मास्थानं कलशस्स एष कविरित्यायाति मायानिधिः ॥

He starts in search of a creditor for money to pass the day peacefully. But unfortunately, he falls into danger and has to escape from his former creditors searching for him. He meets two poets, one young and the other old. That young poet describes the highness of Kalaśa thus.

मत्कुणमक्षिक महिषप्लवङ्ग कौलेयकाजगोष्ठश्वानः ।
पृथक् पृथगवलोक्याः कविकलशे दृष्टिगोचरे जाते ॥

Kalaśa appreciates the young poet for this description.

Many follies of the contemporary society are pointed out with a view to purge them. Many scholars and preachers of puraanas, who try to attract widows with their monkey tricks, saints of Madhva

religion, many masters of monasteries with their disciples etc, are brought into focus through this Prahasana.

A Paramour, son of a great merchant, a Brahmin having illicit contact with a servant-maid, who steals her wealth, when she was asleep, and a married lady namely Ēkastani, who elopes with some other person etc., are the characters in the tragi-comic episodes in this play. None of the characters is dutiful and dignified.

Here is an example from this work. See the Bharatavaakya where he gives a benediction

साधुषु विवेकमत्यो योंगो गाढः शुनो रत इवान्तु ।
त्यक्तुरभिशेफः नुविव दैर्घ्यं मर्त्यायुषां सदा भूयात् ॥

As a Sanskrit reader, I am sorry to find the misconception of humour even in the works of poets like Venkateswara. Of course, this is a type of farce developed by some of the Sanskrit play-wrights aiming at social reform as even such works are being kept in secret and read in solitude by many persons due to the common weakness of human beings.

Ṣaṇḍānuranjana Prahasana of Ghanasyama is also a vulgar farce. His 'Ḍamurakam' deserves appreciation but Ṣaṇḍānuranjana is indecent. Critics are of the opinion that he might have composed this *Prahasana* in the early part of his life as a poet when he was about to bow down to Kāma, the God of love and lust.

Ḍiṇḍima Prahasana of an anonymous author, referred in the preface of Kālidāsa Prahasana, published with Telugu translation is also a vulgar farce.

For our surprise Anidrarativīra Prahasana of Vikrala Seshacharyulu, a contemporary scholar also competes with Kālidāsa Prahasana in its vulgarity. The study of Kālidāsa Prahasana and like *Prahasanas* has led him to mistake the form and nature of Prahasana and to compose such a low and inconsistent *Prahasana*. [1]

1. I had a talk with the poet, Sri Vikrala Seshacharyulu when I met him to get certain *Prahasanas* and I questioned him about his aim in writing such a *Prahasana*. He replied that he had gone through only a few Prahasanas like Kālidāsa Prahasana and thought that the Prahasana must be vulgar. He was unable to get any of the modern or ancient delicate Prahasanas. It proves the importance of proper canvassing of Sanskrit Literature.

COMEDY OF HUMOURS

"But deeds and Language such as man do use,
And persons such as comedy would choose,
When she would show an image of the times,
And sport with human follies, not with crimes
Except we make him such by loving still
Our popular errors when know they're ill.
I mean such errors as you'll all confess
By laughing at them, they deserve no less".[8]

Thus says Ben Jonson explaining his aims and concepts in deriving the new type of comedy i.e., 'comedy of Humours'. The sphere of the word, humour, was not very extensive in the "Comedy of Humour". Ben Jonson used the term, humour, for some sort of uncommon mentality and its actions.

The concept of the Comedy of Humours follows the traditional theory of physiology in which the state of health and by extension, the state of mind of characters depends upon a balance among the four elemental fluids, Black and yellow, blood and phlegm.[9] Depending upon the proportions of the above four elemental fluids some sort of inaptitude functions in human behaviour and shapes the persons like the greedy, the gluttons, the misers, the ramblers, the lazy etc., All these qualities are absurd and require purgation. Otherwise, people become headache to the peaceful, social and individual lives. If one wants to get rid of such sorrows, the fundamental absurdities must be recognised by oneself. Aiming at this, Ben Jonson developed the comedy of humours to utilise it as a sugar-coated pill. Therefore, "the world of his comedy" says Hudson, "is not the world of romance but of contemporary London life with its manners, types, follies and affectioas"[10]. Rickett says that "Shakespeare interpreted life, Jonson and Milton satirized and moralised it."[11]

Selfishness, greed and miserliness are somehow synonyms. They over-power the human lives which in turn surrender to them.

But on the contrary, it is the duty of men to mould the honours and keep them up under their grip.

We naturally accept the demands of children in principle to console them on one hand and to control on the other. The same theory is applicable in overcoming the absurdities like gluttony, greed, selfishness etc. Yielding to them, we have to force them to come under our control. All the absurdities will transform into good qualities and help to lead pleasant life if they are brought into our control. So, by representing the characters of such personalities on the stage, purgation of the defects in the spectators would be done easily. It executes its role wall in establishing a model society. This is the aim of the Comedy of Humours.

In Sanskrit Literature, there appear a few numbers of characters which fall under the Comedy of Humours like, Śakāra in Mṛcchakaṭika, Dindika in Pratijna Yaugandharāyaṇa, some of the characters in Prabōdha Ṣandrōdaya etc., But certain playwrights of modern times aimed at the purgation of the humours of the contemporary Indian Society and contributed a good number of comedy of Humours.

DARIDRA DURDAIVA PRAHASANAM OR THE MISFORTUNE OF THE POOR

This is the contribution of Sri Jīvanyāya Tīrtha, a great Sanskrit scholar of the 20th century. He wrote many Prahasanas. The Daridra Durdaiva Prahasana is being his eighteenth. It differs from the old classical Prahasanas in many aspects. The comment of Alex Preminger on Ben Jonson's comedy of Humours applies to Daridra Durdaiva also. Commenting on Ben Jonson, he says "Jonson Parades before his audience a variety of eccentrics, each of them marked by some particular bias of character, some folly or manners, however of crime which prevents his being satisfactorily humourous."[12]

The theme of this playlet is imaginary. Though the poet says in his preface that it contains some qualities of the comedy of manners[13], the nature of the Comedy of Humours dominates the entire play. Therefore the "misfortune of the Poor" is being dealt with here itself. Let us see the story of the play in the words of the author himself.

"There was a poor Brahmana named Vakreśwara. He was a professional beggar. He had a wife and two young sons. Once he found that the little amount of rice, he had procured by begging would not suffice to feed four hungry stomachs. His wife and sons were too hungry to leave some rise. He knew that they would gobble up the whole portion of rice. Therefore, he concealed a portion in a knot of his cloth round his back.

When he went home, his wife found him ill-equipped. The rice he brought was too insufficient to appease the hunger of all mouths. So, the woman lost her temper and began to use venement explosives against her unlucky husband. Vakreśwara could hardly bear the accuses of his wife. He was disgusted. He made a move to get out and went his way leaving the family to the mercy of fate. As his wife dragged him back by the backknot of his rags, the knot got loose. At once she pounced upon the rice so long hidden in it. The Brahmin was completely taken aback by the discovery of his secret. He was befuddled.

Vakreśwara set out with his wife and children on a begging mission. The merciless Sun was bleaching white the fellow lands. It dried the gullets of the thirsty young boys. The boys lay down under the shade offered by a tree standing nearby. Then a rich merchant passed by that way. The whole family begged alms from him. The clever merchant hurried on without paying any heed to them.

A couple of angles hovering over the scene, noticed the sad plight of the young boys, who wore in a swoon. The angel couple, hailed from the land of God Siva, had a magic wise fulfilling dice with them. The female angel, then asked her spouse to procure water for the suffering boys with the help of the dice. The husband struck

a magic source of water with his dice. The water was then offered to the boys. Now the kind lady persuaded her partner to give the wonderful dice as a gift to Venkateswara.

The poor Brahmin got the dice and cast it hoping to have plenty of rice. He got what he wanted, and his neighbours too had plenty of rice. Jealous of the affluence of his neighbours, he cast the dice for the second time wishing poverty for himself and for his fellow human beings. Shacked by the behaviour of the foolish Brahmin, the male angel snatched the dice from the Brahmin's hands and vanished, before the Brahmin could misuse the dice once more."

The basic element for the subsistence of human beings is selfishness. Selfishness in reasonable limits is no sin. But at times, it reaches the peaks of covetousness and makes men totally greedy. Such avarice degrades man to a mean level. Thus the deeds of a greedy man and their consequences become laughable and at times pitiable. That pity purges the pity and fear in the hearts of spectators. Before evolving the catharsis his foolish actions, absurd behaviour, and their results enable the readers to ridicule him. This Daridra Durdaiva Prahasana deals with such covetousness, its mean forms and its final results.

In this comedy of Humours, the comic depending on characters, is better nourished. The scenes are subordinate to the characters, which are almost miserable. The covetousness in the characters reaches the utmost mark of selfishness. Man's heart is very broad, if he has resources to lead his life cheerfully. If the resources wane day by day, it gets shrunk and cannot accommodate even his spouse and children. That is the pinnacle of selfishness. The name of the hero of this Prahasana is Vakrēśwara, a self-descriptive one. His children Lambōdara and Ṣaḍānana were gluttons. The fellow passenger Kṣudrārāma whom Vakrēśwara met is also stingy. He is a man of great charity, of course with two wonderful principles, not to give out of his house and not to give more than 'Tāmra Paṇārdha' But

none of those characters deserve our sympathy. Only to expedite the same fact, Jīvanyāya Tīrtha brought the siddha couple on to the stage.

In fact, a poor family like that of Vakrēśwara Sarma, should deserve sympathy of the world. But here the envious nature of Śarma, the ill temper of his wife and the gluttony of his boys drive out our sympathy. That is why we are not kind enough towards them, and we simply laugh at them.

Vakrēśwara himself is afraid of his children and keeps some portion of his rice hidden apart.

पथि नास्ति कोऽपि मनुष्यः। इदानीं स्वशरीररक्षार्थं कथं वा तण्डुलान् पृथक्कृत्वा स्थापयामि।

No father should have such a mentality and greed. We hate him or at least we laugh at him but cannot pity him. Even Lambōdara and Ṣaḍānana hide from each other secrets of edibles and quarrel with each other for them. They look eagerly for their father, only for food, not out of any love for him. Thus, these two are laughable. Mandōdarī, the better half of Vakrēśwara wants to fill her belly secretly. On the other hand, she ridicules him severely. Vakrēśwara lost his property, not his ego. He abuses his misfortune in a way that prevents the spectators from showing sympathy to him. see-

द्वारि द्वारि निवारितोऽपि विचरन् हा सारमेयो यथा
दण्डं कुत्र च तण्डुलं किल लभे मुष्ट्यामितं कष्टतः।
प्रत्याख्यानपरं गृहस्थनिकरं दुःश्रव्य शापाक्षरैः
रूक्षै र्बुक्खरवैः करोमि विधुरं त्वास्फालानं निष्फलम्॥

Being a beggar, he accuses rudely those who have not offered him alms. Mandōdari was his second wife. He did not stop to think, whether he could feed and look after her or not. One certain phenomenon of his life is that for every change in his life, his greed alone is responsible. He himself says-

सर्वेषां तण्डुलागमो मम कर्मफलेन समानो यदि स्यात् बर मे दारिद्र्यम्-

This covetousness which drives out man from heaven to hell rightly requires purgation. Murmuring ‘Hare-Rama’ is well invented

in modern Sanskrit literature, especially in Sanskrit dramas following the common man's everyday lives as they succeed in evolving the comic. This type of articulation, at the time of representing the drama attracts the spectators and demands laughter. The keynote of psychology of Vakrēśwara Śarma and other similar persons is the following, which is stated by Vakrēśwara at the end.

अन्धः कुष्ठी दरिद्रो वा प्रतिवेशी वरं भवेत् ।
समान धनगर्वेण स्पर्धमानो हि दुस्सहः ॥

Next, his wife Mandōdari is ill-tempered and sharp tongued like Xanthippe (Wife of Socrates). She always quarrels with her husband, and at times turns to beat him. She is a model wife to all modern wives for she asks her husband, like

तनयौ मम पितृगृहा दानीतौ किम् ?

when Vakrēśwara asks her to quit his house, Mandōdari, a shrew comes out with her legitimate characteristics to delight the spectators.

Kṣudrārāma, the fellow passenger is also a special attraction. His articulation 'Jaya Radhe' like 'Hare Rama' of Vakrēśwara attracts the theatre. In particular the disparity between his words and deeds looks incongruous and we laugh at him. He has learnt from an astrologer that he will become a millionaire. So Kṣudrārāma is prepared to offer the astrologer one lakh rupees for his prediction but only after becoming wealthy. But his final decision is that, not to give a single pie to anybody. Examine his words-

आशासाफल्य संस्फीतं चित्तमन्यादृशं भवेत् ।
अङ्गुष्ठदर्शनं कुर्यात् देवाय च द्विजाय च ॥
अतो न किञ्चित् देयमिति सिद्धान्तः-

The very moment Vakrēśwara begs him. A delicate pun in the conversation between the two provokes laughter.

वक्र :- तत् देहि नः काञ्चन भिक्षाम्

क्षुद्राः- आः (स्वगत) काञ्चनभिक्षां न रजतमं न ताम्रं न तण्डुलं याचतेऽयम्

Kṣudrārāma offers nothing, for he has his own reasons.

पथि भिक्षादानं मे पित्रा निषिद्धम्। जव राये! गृहं गतेभ्यो याचकेभ्यो दीयते यथाशक्ति धर्मादिकम् -

But Vakrēśwara, the experienced beggar agrees even to meet Kṣudrārāma at his residence and asks for the address. Kṣudrārāma afraid of his behaviour puts Vakrēśwara in confusion by giving a zig zag route to find his residence. A conversation between them after getting the address is very interesting as follows

वक्र :- हरे राम ! यदि गच्छेयं भवद्भवनं कीदृशं दानं भवतो लभ्यते।

क्षुद्रा : सर्वेभ्यो यथाशक्ति तावत् दीयते। तुभ्यमपि तावद्दानं न परिहीयते।

वक्र :- तस्य परिमाणं कियत् ?

क्षुद्र :- पूर्वपुरुषक्रमादेषा रीतिर्वर्तते। यदा कदाप्यतिथिः न विमुखी कर्तव्य इति। जयराधे !

वक्र :- पूर्वपुरुषाणा मादेशः कीदृशः ? हरे राम !

क्षुद्र :- ताम्रपणार्थं देयमिति। जयराधे !

वक्र :- हरे राम ! तरपण्यमपि न लब्धव्यम्। धन्योसि कोटिपते !

The twist at the end of the conversation, which is hardly expected by the reader provokes laughter. Even after being rejected by Kṣudrārāma, Vakrēśwara boosts his respectability as -

तृणेषु वंशः खचरेषु हंसः शूरेषु कंसो मशकेषु दंशः।
विप्रेषु वक्रेश्वर शर्मनामा संसार चक्रे विदितो न केन॥

Thus, in this Prahasana all the greedy and voracious eaters get together to entertain the spectators. Misery being the keynote of the misfortune of the poor, turns this Prahasana into a comedy of humours like the comedy of humours of Ben Jonson. Besides creating this humour, it teaches us a lot.

Finally, Jīvanyāyathīrtha has succeeded in representing the defects of individuals in a poetic and artistic manner to regenerate

the selfless nature evolving the fascinating delight. In one word Daridra Durdaiva offers delight to those starved of comic and humour.

It may also be called Black-comedy.

RAAGAVIRAAGA PRAHASANA:

Tastes differ from man to man, from time to time and from place to place. But the taste of an individual is not akin to the taste of another. Variation in interests goes on and on. So, one should not try to impose or dictate terms regarding one's taste. This particularly applies to rulers and officers who have many followers and subordinates. In Rāgavirāga Prahasana of Jīvanyāyathīrtha we find a king with such vested interests.

A certain king who hated music prohibits music and musicians under his rule. After some days, one fine morning, he happened to hear music played by a young couple in his court itself. On hearing the delightful programme, he suddenly changes his mind and lifts out the ban on music. He then approves importance of music

In the first Sandhi (act) of this play, a musician enters singing and begging. He wants to see the king. But the gate keeper doesn't permit him. The beggar asks for 'Guḍa' (Jaggery) but the gate keeper offers him a 'Laguḍa' (a beating stick). This provokes laughter. Despite his efforts to get the proper things he is forced to flee, and the soldiers chase him. Previously there has been another solider who is a singer. A quarrel takes place between those two resulting in the escape of this beggar. All this creates momentary comic in the hearts of the spectators, when it is played on the stage. At one stage the king agrees to listen to music but offers no rewards. This rigid nature of the king and the absurdity of that notion once again makes him laughable. If lovely music accompanies this play, the performance gives us great pleasure.

KAUNḌINYA PRAHASANA

A Telugu proverb[14] which means that all professions are just means to earn one's livelihood, has stressed the importance of living. But just living does not make life. There are people who live to eat, having no objective or purpose to pursue. There are some other who eat to live. Food is not everything. These people work hard to realize their aims and thereby put their lives to the best possible use. As such gluttons who just live to cream their bellies with whatever that is edible are laughed at and made fun of.

Once people who are healthy and strong have resorted to begging just of laziness and disinclination to work. Charity had lost its virtue. Gṛdhranāsa and Jihmalā comes under the second category of the above two in this comedy of humours.

Fortunately, Kaunḍinya, the hero of the play is more than Gṛdhranāsa. He is fond of pleasant food prepared in others' house. Like a spy he enquires about all the delicious dishes in each and every house just by smelling them. He has hailed from a family of such a quality. He feels it his duty to take food in other's house. He says अहो! परान्न भोजनं नाम स्वर्गभोगो मनुष्याणाम्. Based on these three characters Mahalinga Sastry has developed the thought of dividing gluttony and its minus value.

Jihmalā and Gṛdhranāsa enter the stage thinking deeply of finding out a way of selecting edibles for their dinner even after having their 'Dwādaśi Pāraṅa' as a breakfast with many dishes. Jihmalā lists out many sweets and asks her husband to select one. Then Gṛdhranāsa feels it.

प्रिये! उपस्थिते भक्ष्यवर्गे अन्यतम सीकरणम् नाम बहुपत्नीकस्य दक्षिण नायकस्य महत् बहुमान सङ्कटं जिह्वाशालिनाम् ॥

After deliberate consultations, he could however select "Guḍaçipiṭaka" and starts to market to bring grapes and cardamom seeds etc.; But at the very moment, he happens to meet Kaunḍinya, a voracious eater.

However, he escapes from him, supporting his own behaviour by saying as-

नित्यं परान्न लोभाय निर्व्यापारेण तिष्ठते ।
न दद्याद्वासमन्नं वा द्विजायाप्पलसात्मने ॥

Then enters Kaunḍinya. The soliloquy of Kaunḍinya for a while is really delightful with full of comic. Kaunḍinya used to have some principles and 'Sūktis' including epigrams and parodies explaining the importance of taking food from others' houses. Let us examine for instance-

आतिथ्यसूत्रकारैः नूनं चिन्तारत्न मस्मद्धस्तगतं विहितम् । तथाहि-

कुतस्सम्भारचिन्ता मे कुतो मे पाकसम्भ्रमः ।
देशकालविदा पात्रे समिते नैव स्थीयते ॥

काममविगीतेयमीदृशी परान्न नियम चर्या । यतः -

नार्थसङ्ग्रहणे लोभो नेर्ष्या स्फीतेषु वस्तुषु ।
न स्वीयं न पराधीन मातिथ्ये केवले स्थितिः ॥

All the poor people think that "परगृह भोजनम्" is a curse, and it is included in the list of the eight unpleasant circumstances. But Kaunḍinya calls it a heavenly meal This type of absurdity in his statement is provoking laughter. Besides this peculiar quality he has other qualities. He is not at all interested in earning money. He is never envious. But the only thing he wants is to depend on others for his food.

His boasting about his own family reveals how gluttonous they are. His uncle Vaṭikānātha Miśra stands first in eating. He was very famous for eating one hundred "Vaṭikas" (round cakes made of pulses)

कृत्वा पणं हि वटिकाशतभक्षणाय
पूर्णे नवाधिक नवत्यशनेऽथ यस्य ।
उद्गीर्णलोचनयुगस्य पुरा मुमूर्षोः
शिष्टैक सङ्ग्रहरुचिं कृतिनस्स्मरन्ति ॥

Gaṇanātha is the tutelary deity of their family. Then Kaunḍinya sees the greedy Gṛdhranāsa. By reading his demeanour Kaunḍinya smells that something is going to be prepared in Gṛdhranāsa's house and walks towards his house. He sits in front of the house and begins to sing about the glorious and pleasant life of like-minded people. This a fine parody.

चिन्ता नास्ति किल तेषां चिन्ता नास्ति किल ॥
परगृह भोजन परितुष्टानां नित्यातिथ्योत्सव निष्ठानाम् ॥
कालत्रय विरतोद्योगानां किञ्च समेताधिक भोगानाम् ॥
गृहमेधि निमन्त्रण चित्तानां षड्रसभरिताशन मत्तानाम् ॥

It is parody for a Philosophical lyric 'चिन्ता नास्ति किल' etc., of Sada Siva Brahmam. The complete form of the lyric is given in the chapter 'Parody'.

This alone can prove the outstanding poetic talent of the poet in nourishing the Hāsya.

The original lyric is very melodious even if the element of Parody is set aside. But this element of Parody adds to the beauty of the lyric and provokes mirth. This is the best type of comedy in the *Prahasana*.

At the same moment Jihmalā waiting for her husband recognises Kaunḍinya. She was afraid of his presence there. Her husband is expected through the main door. But Gṛdhranāsa enters through the back door. They mix the grapes and cardamom seeds with "Guḍaçipiṭaka", which is already prepared. Kaunḍinya smells it. Here, the poet Mahalinga Sastry introduces a parody through Kaunḍinya to the verse of Kalidāsa.

तज्जिह्मला प्रस्तुत मस्ति किञ्चित् नूनं गृहान्तर्गुड संविधानम् ।
जिह्वाजुषा मादृत संशयेषु किल प्रमणं रसना जलार्द्रा ॥

Compare with-

असशयं क्षत्र परिग्रहक्षमा यदार्यमस्याभिलाषि मे मनः ।
सतां हि सन्देह पदेषु वस्तुषु प्रमाण मन्तःकरणप्रवृत्तयः ॥

Kaunḍinya also enters by the back door. Meanwhile Gṛdhranāsa hurries to gulp that 'Guḍaçipiṭaka at once though it is very hot. It scorches his tongue and his eyes turnup. Kaunḍinya asks for the reason, but Jihmalā lies that he has been ill for a few days. He denies her statement saying, "I have just seen him entering through the back door". But she replies that he had gone to a doctor and that is why it happened so.

However, accepting her request, he prepares to go out to call for a doctor to treat Gṛdhranāsa. But, Kaunḍinya had hidden himself behind the grain storage, (कुसूल). The next minute, Gṛdhranāsa gets up to eat the preparation completely before Kaunḍinya's arrival. Jihmalā, going to shut the door, witnesses Kaunḍinya hidden at the back of the storage. She reveals the fact to her husband without making any noise. At this stage, the play takes a new turn. Gṛdhranāsa begins to narrate the story of a 'Brahma Rākṣasa' and goes to Kaunḍinya to beat him with a dust bin. But Kaunḍinya jumps up suddenly and beats Gṛdhranāsa. He throws the dust over his face and hurriedly swallows the entire 'Guḍaçipiṭaka' and exits bravely concluding thus :-

न वितरति बुभुक्षा क्षीण सत्वाय भिक्षां
यदिगृह मुपगम्योपात्त दीनाक्षराय ।
सुविहित मपि भक्तं तस्य लुब्धस्य वक्त्रं
प्रदहतु बुसकल्पं नीरसत्वञ्च यातु ॥

Thus, this is a comedy of humours with simple wit and splendid humour. But in the second act in the discourse between Kaunḍinya and Jihmalā and in the episode of Brahmarākaṣasa, humour is rare. There is no scope for sudden glory, but the rest of the play is full of charming comic. Kaunḍinya dominates the play and therefore it is called Kaunḍinya Prahasana. Especially the first act and the soliloquy of Kaunḍinya at the beginning of the second act are appreciable with their impressive humour. Indelicacy and vulgarity are not found in this play. Royal gluttony is the principal theme of this comedy of Humour.

आत्मस्तुतिप्रहसनम् of an unknown author referred in अर्वाचीन सत्कृत वाङ्मय of Sri Varnekar is also a comedy of humours in which self-elevation or self-applaud is the main thing subjected to rectification.

Amarṣa Mahimā of Venkatacharya is a simple and nice *Prahasana*. If we cannot face the censure of some persons, we keep quiet for the time being. But we ourselves censure, when others are unable to face our censure. That is the human tendency, and Amarṣa Mahimā is based on the same psychological stature.

Ramachandra is the main character in this. Being displeased with his wife's negligence in preparing food in time, he goes to his office without food. In the office he exchanges words with his assistant Chandrasekhar for no reason except the anger towards his wise wife. Chandrasekhar goes home with the same heat and flares over his better half Saroja. This is the chain of actions. This shows how humorous the human tendency is, and also how foolish the anger is.

As a counterpart to the Rāga Virāga Prahasana we see a *Prahasana* of गजानन बालकृष्ण पलसुले namely धन्येयं गायनी कला.

It reads like a parody. King Chakramāditya of Tanajāpura is the hero of this play. His name refers immediately to Vikramāditya, a great legendary king in Indian History. The readers compare Chakramāditya with him. This results in the outburst of comic from the hearts of the spectators. He opens a hair dressing saloon. His courtiers encourage him to perform great deeds like cutting the tails of donkeys, as Vikramāditya used to cut the tails of tigers.

One fine morning, he happens to listen to a great musician and feels happy. The musician requests Chakramāditya to honour his art instead of himself and to give proper place to music in his Kingdom.

At the very moment, the King saying "मरिष्के शोभना अयिडिया आगता" orders all his people to speak only in poetry and to hang any person speaking prose. This foolishness draws anger, even from his kith and kin.

The conversation in his Kingdom following the order is very interesting and amusing. Here is a dialogue between a purchaser and a storekeeper.

लीटरमेकं ददातु तैलं नान्यदिष्यते इदमेवालम्
अर्धन्यूनं रूप्यपञ्चकं देयं जातमतीवाल्पकम् ॥

This play is very humorous, and one has to thank Mr. Gajanana Palasala for contributing a wonderful Prahasana like this to the Sanskrit Prahasana Literature.

The Ṣipiṭakaṣarvaṇa Prahasana of Jīvanyāyathīrtha is also a comedy of humours. The foolish efforts of the misers to save their money, and their untoward consequences are described in this comedy of humours in a funny manner. The poet shows here how a miser keeps away all his friends and is hated by them including his wife. No doubt money has its importance, but money is not the only end of one's life. Jīvanyāyathīrtha exposes the same in this play and enlightens the audience.

COMEDY OF MANNERS

"Comedy of manners, in other words comedy of wit has for its main subject and theme, the behaviour of men and women living under special conditions. It tends to be preoccupied with the conditions of the middle and upper classes and is often marked by elegant wit and sophistication".[15] P.P. Mehta while dealing with the comedy of manners in his 'Comedy' says "that the comedy of manners is usually set in a highly sophisticated society and the main characters are usually very witty and lax in moral tone. The situations are very often farcical and vulgar, and its humour is mainly verbal". [16]

Comedy of manners, known also as the "Restoration comedy" in English Literature had been brought out in the later part of the seventeenth century to reflect the aspirations and manners of the society. In the case of Sanskrit Literature Comedy of manners, came into being in seventh century A.D. Mattavilāsa Prahasana, the very first Prahasana available so far is a comedy of manners consisting of the contemporary down fallen religious conditions, and degrading morality. Though both farces like Laṭakamēlaka and comedy of manners like Mattavilāsa Prahasana have aimed at the purgation of the follies of the society, the central point of the plot and the way of narration differ. Verbal and witty comic rather than vulgar and farcical humour, mainly appear in comedy of manners, but the later dominates the farce. The ruins of different religious schools are the main subjects in the restoration type of comedy in old Sanskrit Literature, which rightly appear in Mattavilāsa Prahasana. Let us examine the same being followed by others-

Mattavilāsa Prahasana is a superb comedy of manners of Mahēndra Vikrama Varma which is neither indecent nor vulgar. All the characters, contexts and their consequences in this comedy of manners sub-serve the plot which is intended only to satirize and moralise the contemporary society.

Decadence of Buddhism is the main subject in this Prahasana. The way of the play-wright Mahendra Vikrama Varma in satirising the contemporary evils, is very sharp, powerful, simple and sympathetic. The mockery is dexterously associated with the plot to strengthen it along with the sentiment of comic. However, the chief content of the theme is only Satire.

Kapālī a notorious drunkard, heavily drunk with his young wife, Devasōma, commits a sin by murmuring Jaina Philosophy. He wants to purify his polluted tongue by drinking more wine and enters the arrack shop in Kāṇci. After sitting for his drink he doesn't find his *Kapāla*, his container for drink. He is disappointed for losing his *Kapāla* and missing toddy. He is afraid of committing one more sin by refusing the toddy, and drinks with a Gōsṛñga. Later on, he takes off in search of his *Kapāla* He suspects dogs or followers of Buddhism by reason there was a piece of meat in the *Kapāla*. At that juncture, a Ṡākyabikṣu appears concealing a vessel under his clothes. Looking at him Kapāli mistakes the vessel with Ṡākyabikṣu for his *Kapāla* and quarrels with him. Both of them move to Pāṡupata for justice. On the way they come across a lunatic Unmattaka holding the *Kapāla* of Kapāli snatched from a dog which had stolen it previously. Without any hesitation Kapāli takes back his *Kapāla*.

In the interlude of this *Prahasana*, the actress enters on to the stage angrily and questions the *Sūtradhāra* as-

किं चिरकालस्य यौवनगुणभर मत्तविलासप्रहसनं दर्शयितु मागतोऽसि

calling his attention to the unpleasant state of affairs. But *Sūtradhāra* taking 'Mattavilāsa' to the name of the *Prahasana* to be enacted replies positively. But the actress refuses to act with him by saying

तयैव तावत् दर्शय या त्वया सह रमयितव्या ।

This domestic but simple comedy based on Fun is a remarkable one. It humbly strikes the strings of our hearts.

This Mattavilāsa Prahasana grips the reader. Noone will give up this comedy until he completes it. At the beginning of the play, we find some simple spoonerisms and malapropisms which produce a bit of humour. Kapāli calls his wife Dēvasōmā as Sōmadēvā which results in the anger of Dēvasōmā. After a while she recollects and seeks the help of her husband to get up. As both are intoxicated with toddy Kapāli falls down but feels that Dēvasōmā left him. The comic here is based on movements. Kapāli's blessing Lord Siva is the climax of the intoxication. Read-

पैया सुरा प्रियतमा मुखमीक्षितव्यं ग्राह्यः स्वभावललितो विकृतश्च वेषः
येनेदमीदृशमदृश्यत मोक्षवर्त्म दीर्घायुरस्तु भगवान् स पिनाकपाणिः ॥

After satirising the "Kāpālikā Theory" (शाक्तेयम्) in this manner, Kapāli at once turns to throw light on the defects of the philosophy of Jainism as follows.

कार्यस्य निस्संशय मात्महेतोः स्वरूपतां हेतुभि रभ्युपेत्य ।
दुःखस्य कार्यं सुखमामनन्तः श्वेनैव वाक्येन हता वराकाः ॥

Kapāli is very fond of toddy. He elevates and exalts it with many hyperboles and metaphors. For him toddy is not less than the liquid phenomenon of *Madana*. So, he spares no remark in appreciation of the toddy.

एषा भगवती वारुणी चषकेष्वावर्जिता प्रत्यादेशो मण्डनाना मनुनयः प्रणय कुपितानां पराक्रमो यौवनस्य जीवितं विभ्रमाणाम् ।

On the other hand, Kapāli showers blessings on his liquor container, *Kapāla.* Losing his *Kapala* is as miserable to him as the suffering of one who is separated from his wife. Here is his lamentation

येन मम पान भोजनशयनेषु नितान्तमुपकृतं शुचिना ।
तस्याद्य मां वियोगः सन्मित्रस्येव पीडयति ॥

The poet, makes the best use of the opportunity to satirise the Buddhistic Philosophy as-

तर्कयामि नृत्यमांसगर्भत्वात् सुना वा शाक्यभिक्षुणावेति (अपहृतः)

Although the Parity between a dog and a Buddhistic monk is a cruel joke, it is a part and parcel of the story to satirize the Buddhistic manners and therefore it is unavoidable.

The character of Śākyabikṣu is also a subject of *Hāsya*, who being vexed at the old and improper constitution of Buddhism written in *Piṭakas*, wants to alter it suggesting many amendments. See-

अवश्यमेतैः दुष्टबुद्धस्थविरैः निरुत्साहैरस्माकं तरुणजनानां मत्सरेण पिटकपुस्तकेषु स्त्री सुरापान विधानानि परामृष्टानीति तर्कयामि ।

It is very funny and shows an evidence of the decline in the contemporary Buddhistic stature. The irregular and irresponsible thoughts of Ṡākyabikṣu just for the sake of his selfishness and parsimony of desires, purge our hearts. We may sympathise with Buddhism but at the same time we laugh at its ridiculousness. Moreover, Kapāli's allegation that Ṡākyabikṣu has stolen his *Kapāla*, ironically criticises Buddha in the following words-

नूनमेवमादि प्रच्छदननिमित्तं बहुचीवरधारणं बुध्देनोपदिष्टम् ।
वेदान्तेभ्यो गृहीत्वार्थान् यो महाभारतादपि ।
विप्राणां मिषतामेव कृतवान् कोश सञ्चयम् ॥

Kapāli, Dēvasōmā and Ṡākyabikṣu begin to quarrel among themselves. Dēvasōmā tries to catch Ṡākyabikṣu by the hair but in vain. She falls down. Then Ṡākyabikṣu nails to the counter at once and says as-

अहो बुद्धस्य विज्ञानं येन मुण्डनं दृष्टम्

It rightly proves the pitiable situations of the bad practices in Buddhism and its customs but does not forego its grip in evoking comic.

Unmattaka also plays his own part in provoking laughter. Being a lunatic, he mistakes *Kapāla* for a golden vessel and without any hesitation expresses the same. Hearing that 'Ṡākyabikṣu' questions as किमयमुन्मत्त. Then Unmattaka obediently requests Ṡākyabikṣu to show the person Unmattaka, by taking the Kapāla. We laugh at Unmattaka for his absent mindedness. Mahēndra Vikrama Varma has deftly utilized Unmattaka's mental disability to derive laughter from the readers.

The poet's main intention seems to be to satirise and moralise the Jainism and Ṡāktēya Partly, and Buddhism almost wholly in this Prahasana. Alleging Ṡākyabikṣu as a thief, Kapāli scolds and scorns all the theories and customs of Buddhism. Though Ṡākyabikṣu is not really a thief, his behaviour qualifies him to be scoffed at. Thus, Mattavilāsa Prahasana is a farce according to the traditional *Prahasana* theory, but it is really a comedy of manners with polished and polite comic.

Most of the ancient *Prahasanas*, though satirical, are mainly farces. Despite satirising the contemporary social conditions with their evils, the poets were interested in dealing with them as a farce only. So, comedy of manners had very little advantage for its existence in ancient *Prahasanas*. Let us see some of the modern *Prahasanas* which basically are the comedies of manners.

Vanabhōjana Prahasana of Jīvanyāyathīrtha, composed to be enacted at Bankimcḥandra Mahāvidyālaya is a comedy of manners. Ever since human beings have grown civilized and cultured 'picnics have become a part of their entertainment. Now-a-days people want just to while away their time in what even way they choose. They have given up all restrictions. If foolishness too is added to such a life, we can imagine the consequences. The main reason for all this non-sense lies with the organisations in general and with organisers in particular. As a matter of fact, organisers, devoted, brilliant, frank and punctual are very rare. By reason of it many picnics have been totally abused. Satirizing all these events in a funny manner Jīvanyāyathīrtha composed this Vanabhōjaną Prahasana.

Supriya, Dēvapriya, Sumantra, Abhirāma, Subuddhi and Atirāma are college students. They arrange a picnic and make all arrangements, allot their duties and start with less luggage. They begin to cook their food under a big tree. Being afraid of the falling of the droppings of birds they begin to think of the remedies. They want to use bows and slings to terrify the birds. But after a second thought they suspect the uselessness of bows and arrows and prefer to change the venue into an old and ruined temple nearby. They then realize that they have forgotten to bring the firewood with them which is left at the residence itself. Dēvapriya starts with a sickle to bring firewood and Supriya and Subuddhi follow him.

While doing their duty Subuddhi suspects the presence of a tiger there. Supriya runs away. Subuddhi bravely awaits the tiger. But to his surprise a beggar comes out frightening Subuddhi more than a tiger does and Subuddhi flees.

At night the lamp goes off due to their negligence and the place becomes dark. None of the pack of fools comes forward to light the

lamp for it is not their scheduled duty, then they come to an agreement that the person who begins to talk first has to light the lamp. Having laid down the condition they keep silent. Then enters the beggar, lights lamp, eyes all the silent creatures, consumes the prepared food, and carries away all the things easy to carry.

At this juncture enter three policemen and arrest the beggar. But he cleverly shows these six fools. The policemen arrest the six fools but none of them opens his lips and so they have to follow the policemen. The head of the Police mistakes them for drunkards and begins to smite them. After receiving the very first stroke Atipriya cries bitterly 'म्रियेऽहम्'. Then all of them begin to talk and get rid of the policemen.

We may call this *Prahasana* as comedy of fools rather than comedy of manners. All these stupid students are the birds of the same feathers. It appears that they are wise fools or foolish wits. Like the legendary disciples of Paramanandaiah, they are experts in complicating the simplest thing and evoke laughter.

Minding one's own business is no doubt a good attitude. One has to be co-operative with others when the need arises. Lacking this nature results in difficulties, more so when the persons concerned are dunces. Such a simple thing as lighting the lamp has brought forth an ugly turn of incidents, just because the persons concerned are fools without common sense. The absurdity of the situation and their incapacity to rise to the occasion evokes laughter. Good thought and bad practice result in grief as in the case of the present comedy of manners.

A simple epigram in this comedy of manners is very attractive. Supriya mistakes the beggar for a tiger and runs away. But Subuddhi after recognising him as a beggar takes off. Here the beggar represents the dishonest and miserable stature of the beggars in the society. See the epigrammatical verse in this connection-

शार्दूलो मर्दयेज्जीवं वने निर्धूय चेतनाम् ।
भिक्षुकोऽर्दति जीवन्तं वसन्तं यत्र कुत्र वा ॥

A song where Supriya and Devapriya glorify the belly too is funny. Read the lyric-

उदर त्वमदो परमं ब्रह्म
प्रेयः श्रेयस्साधनरम्य - दानवमानव कीटपतङ्गान्
किन्नरगण शुभनिर्जर संङ्घान्
व्यापृणुषे वपुरन्तरगम्य
त्वयि मति रास्तां मम जननम्य
चर्ममय त्वं कर्म विशालम्
तनुषे नन्दित जीवन कालम्
प्राणरसायन महिमस्तम्भ
प्रियजय जित गिरि गह्वरदम्भ -

This type of gluttony is always laughable either in a drama or in real life.

The customs, traditions, social values and the ways of life of men in a society depend on the time they live in and change according to times. Those who could not adapt themselves to the rapid changes of the time and stick to the dead habits, fail to lead a peaceful life. Thus, a gap between the traditionalists and reformers results in many problems. Early marriages and 'Kanyāśulkam' ("Selling Girls") have been some of the main problems of our predecessors and now we have to attack the dowry system. We have enough literature in Indian languages projecting the problems of both "Selling of Girls", and dowry system. In Sanskrit Prahasanas, of course not very extensive but quite full is Vivāhaviḍambana Prahasana of Jīvanyāyathīrtha, based on early marriages and 'Kanyāśulkam'.

In this Prahasana Ratikānta wants to marry at the age of sixty. He has a widowed sister namely Khaḍgadhārā. Mutual mocking is their breakfast. They agree with each other once in a blue moon. Ghaṭaka appreciates the desire of Ratikānta to marry and comes forth to fulfil that. Kanakā a servant of Ratikānta is against his master's marriage, but Ratikānta tantalizes him by promising to increase his salary soon after his marriage and gets his support.

Ghaṭaka settles Ratikānta matrimony with Ćandrarēkhā, daughter of a peon, but Ratikānta has to pay two thousand rupees for marriage expenses and to free his would-be father-in-law from his debts. Ratikānta is eager to see Chandrarēkha before marriage, but Ghaṭaka does not allow him. Moreover, he suggests him not to see Ćandrarēkhā, before wedding except in the guise of the bridegroom's father. To present himself young Ratikānta pays a big sum of money to physician, but the medicine doesn't help. He gets many ornaments for Ćandrarēkha. But all of a sudden, he finds Ćandrarēkha already married to a young man by name Bhāskara. He laments over his ill luck.

This is the plot developed in this Prahasana. All these characters individually represent a sector of persons. Ratikānta represents the old youngsters, like a merchant who sells his account books after losing everything. Khaḍgadhārā represents his many unfortunate young widows who do not allow at least others to be happy out of jealousy. But both Ratikānta and Khaḍgadhārā are moulded by the society. The physician represents those who exploit the weakness of others, for their advantage. Ghaṭaka is a prompt broker. With all these main characters the poet has dramatized a social problem.

Ratikānta defeated by Parsimony points out even his sister without courtesy like this-

भोजने द्विगुणा मात्रा शयने च चतुर्गुणा ।
कार्यकाले रवमात्रा च ततः शूर्पणखा स्वरः ॥

But Khaḍgadhāra too has a gruff voice and instead of keeping quiet she scoffs at her brother as-

यष्टिधारी षष्टिवर्षः सहर्षः स्थविरो वरः ।
चन्द्रलेखा स्पर्शकामः करं विस्तारयत्यहो ॥

Looking at this brother and sister we are reminded of Lubdhāvadhānulu and Mīnākṣi in 'Kanyāsulkam', a well-known Telugu drama of Gurajada Appa Rao.

Ratikānta pays the doctor willingly to rejuvenate his youth, but abuses him in his absence. This deed shows the human weakness and makes us laugh at Ratikānta.

The comedy of manner is closely associated with Satire. See the concluding verse of Ratikānta after foregoing everything

घटको घोटकश्चैव स्यान्मनोरथचालकः ।
क्वचिसन्निधिमासाद्य पदाघात प्रियःपुनः ॥

Another comedy of manners of Hari Jīvana Miśra is Palāṇḍumaṇḍana Prahasana which is unique of its kind. It is intended to picturise the different types of food and edibles of Brahmins living in different parts of India.

भारतस्य विभिन्न प्रदेशेषु निवसतां ब्राह्मणानां भोजनरीति मधिकृत्य विनोदकरणमेव ।

is the motif of this Prahasana in the words of the author.

Generally, Brahmins in south India are vegetarians, where as in north India, like Bengal they eat non-vegetarian food like fish. In South India some Brahmins dislike onion. All the different tastes and tendencies have encouraged Hari Jīvana Miśra to compose a prahasana like this.

Liñgōji Bhaṭṭa is the hero of this Prahasana, who has recently married second time. Consummation of Liñgōji and Cịnçā has been centralised in this comedy of manners to narrate all the different tastes and eatables. All the characters in this play are named after their tastes and practices in their daily life like Palāṇḍumaṇḍana, Raktamūlika, Laśunapanta etc. The Hasya evolved in this prahasana is really materialised and therefore it is fantastic. All the comic elements are simple and delicate and make the spectators rejoice at once. A hymn in praise of a rat is a form of parody and very much entertaining.

Read-

मूषको वै प्रजापति रासीत्। तस्य द्वौ दन्ता वास्ताम् । दन्तेन बिलं करोति । भाण्डं स्फोटयति । चू चू शब्दं करोति ।... यजमानं स्वर्गलोकं गमयति । अवे वेद ।

We all know ‘Pakōdi’ a simple dish prepared with onion. Hari Jīvana Miśra venerates and elevates it as if it were the greatest in the following manner.

अये लशुनपोटिके सकलदुःख सन्त्रोटिके
महापथसुघोटिके परमपाप सम्मोटिके ।
सुगन्धहृततोटिके परमसिद्धिसच्छोटिके
प्रसीदपरमेश्वर क्षुधित तृप्ति सद्रोटिके ॥

Similarly, in 'Manōharam Dinam' of A R. Habare, we see a student with all tricks, plans and fickle mindedness trying to leave his institution. Karmaphalam of Rāmanātha Miśra published in 1955 is also a comedy of manners describing the ups and downs of the present Indian society, and trying for a solution to remove them and promote the values of Indian Society.

In general, many lovers of the dramatic art feel that the current cine-technique is dominating the dramatic art, and the dramatic associations are in ruin, solely because of the actors who are either sincere without talent or talented without sincerity. Unfortunately, there is the curse of Nahuṣa towards actors quoted by Bharata in the thirty sixth chapter of his Nātyasāstra (kasi edition). The story of curse may be true or false, but the position of actors has not been improved so far. In these circumstances it is not easy to stage a drama with all its' techniques and costly equipment. Natyē Ca Dakṣā Vayam of Kṣīrasāgara is a comedy of manners patronising all the difficulties in enacting a drama.

In this Prahasana, Sūtradhāra is supposed to enact Vikramōrvaśīya, a drama of Kālidāsa. All the actors even after agreeing to represent particular roles give trouble to Sūtradhāra without co-operating with him. At last, he bows down before them, but they refuse to oblige. Disgusted, Sūtradhāra leaves the place praying to the Goddess of Dance to save the dramatic art from the iron hands of the so-called actors. It rightly represents the contemporary social condition of professional actors, their manners and the decay of the dramatic art.

DOMESTIC COMEDY

"A counterpart to domestic tragedy, it (Domestic Comedy) is a form of Drama, predominantly about the upper middle class and middle class life and characters. It has been particularly fashionable since the late 19th century, and as the term suggests, it is often concerned with family situations and problems"[17] is the explanation of the Domestic Comedy given by Cuddon. The system of the household is the most important factor in the Indian Society. It consists of a group of persons, parents, children and their relatives. Relationship develops according to their traditions and customs, desires, aims and inclinations. In spite of different opinions, living together is unavoidable in every family like the Parliament with members of different parties having their own settled opinions. If the opposition is lacking stability the parliament carries out the matters in a smooth manner. Likewise, a family without opposition, also runs smoothly. Such families do not give scope for domestic comedies. But there are certain other families, which welcome the play-wright to expose their follies.

If the wife is a shrew and the husband soft, it gives scope for domestic comedy. When the husband is a tyrant, and his wife a good naturally with a low protest it becomes a domestic comedy. As the children are the bits of the same cloth, their behaviour also leads to a domestic comedy and invites laughter. Elders want to mould the youngsters as they wish, but the youngsters feel that they are being dictated, and they revolt. Thus, the expected goals of the elders are defeated. The disparity in the natures between the aged and the youngsters give scope for domestic comedy.

Middle class people in this society live between the hammer and the nail. The unsolved problems and unfulfilled desires make some of them misers and greedy and some others extravagant and spend thrifts. Either way domestic comedy involves the comedy of humours, problem comedy etc., But due to the importance given to the domestic affairs it is named domestic comedy.

In Sanskrit literature, there are hardly works based on middle class people. A small number of *Prakaraṇas* have picturised the lives of the middle-class people sympathetically but not in a ridiculous manner. If we want pure domestic comedies we have to search only in modern literature. A large number of the modern families are ruined by false prestige, useless pump and a foolish desire to show off. Though no one can cure this malady completely, writers like Ben Jonson endeavoured at least to point out their flaws to them. Now let us see the various domestic comedies in Sanskrit *Prahasana* literature.

LĪLĀVILĀSA PRAHASANAM:

In the Trio of K.L.N. Sastry's plays, Līlāvilāsa Prahasana is an impressive domestic comedy. In this *Prahasana*, he has represented the variations and differences seen in household's life, its consequences and disparities between generations, especially the consequences of lack of unity among the family members, who have aged sons and daughters but not proper understandings.

Gautama and Ćandrikā are an aged couple. They have two children, Līlā and Satyavrata. Both of them are in their teens. Līlā's marriage is the current problem in that house. Gautama selects Vēdāntabhaṭṭa great scholar, who is a block head in common sense point of view, to give away his daughter. But Ćandrikā offers her daughter to Somila, a wealthy drunkard. There begins the cat and dog life of wife and husband. Gautama wants scholarship and Ćandrikā wants opulence, but they are blind to the lapses of Vedanta Bhatta and Somila. Despite these two proposals, Līlā loves Vilāsa a close friend of Satyavrata. She takes pains and marries Vilāsa playing a drama with the help of her bother. At last Gautama and Ćandrikā recognise Vilāsā's heroism and approve their marriage. This is the plot of the play.

Līlāvilāsa Prahasana completely follows the modern tendency in writing humourous plays rather than the ancient *Prahasanas.* The

fancy in the plot and the fashion in the treatment are fascinating. It consists of seven acts instead of one or two.

At the very beginning of this *Prahasana, Sūtradhāra*, a novice at home and a ruffian abroad enters and says -

अहं लम्बोदरस्साक्षादहं दामोदरः परः ।
अहं मृत्युञ्जयस्साक्षा दहं वृद्धः पितामहः ॥

अहमेव परं दैव महं परमपूरुषः ।

मत्तः परतरो नास्ति.....

At once, the actress come forth and asks 'रे अहम् ।'. What a pity. *Sūtradhāra* immediately stops his boastings and says त्वमेव मम देवता. His obedience towards his wife, his dismay with a comparison to his boastings arises sudden laughter in spectators. Then *Sūtradhāra* and *Naṭi* come to a conclusion to enact a fictitious quarrel to refresh the audience which becomes a good *Prahasana* or domestic comedy and prepare for the same but not before they hear the real quarrel, of Gautama and Ṣandrikā from the background which results in their exit and the entry of Gautama and Ṣandrikā.

This *Prahasana* is a treasure of merriment, its delight depending chiefly on conversations. Gautama, being an arrogant, mistakes the *Dharma Sāstra* which reads as दरिद्रे दीयते दानं सफलं पाण्डुनन्दन and takes firm decision to give away Līlā to Vēdāntabhaṭṭa. Ṣandrikā argues with him like an atheist. See the conversation.

चन्द्रिका :- अस्तु एतादृशं महाधर्मज्ञं त्वामिदं पृच्छामि अपि त्वया तव वृद्धः पिता क्वापि तीर्थे निक्षिप्तः ।

गौतम :- कसुय होतोः ?

चन्द्रिका :- वृद्ध तीर्थेषु निक्षिपेदिति खल्वाह मनुः ।

गौतम :- पितरि जीवति नैतत् धर्मशास्त्रं मया श्रुतम् । अन्यथा तद्वचनम् अकरिष्यम् ।

चन्द्रिका :- नाद्यापि किञ्चित् छिन्नम्। आवयोः पुत्रं सत्यव्रतं वचन मेतदध्यापयामि येन सः त्वां वृद्ध क्वापि तीर्थे निमज्जयिष्यति

By this her logic does not come to an end. Many clever arguments follow due to the foolishness of Gautama. Gautama begins to explain the greatness and respectability of poverty which Ćandrikā tears to pieces the next moment.

Moreover, withstanding on her own theory Ćandrikā gives proper evidence. Read-

दुन्दुभिस्तु नितरामचेतनः तन्मुखादपि घनं धनं घनम् ।
कांश्य पात्रमपि यन्नपुंसकं तच्च रौति हि पणं पणं पणम् ॥

This is a fantastic imagination to evolve comic. The sounds of a drum and a vessel made of bronze are imitated as धनम् and पणम्. Then this quarrel reaches its climax. Līlā enters and tries to pacify them. But her mother's arrogance doesn't yield

The second act, particularly applaudable, can stand as an individual *Prahasana*. Vēdabhaṭṭa with his son, Vēdāntabhaṭṭa and Chaplain comes to Gautama's house to settle his son's marriage with Līlā. Even in their presence Ćandrikā doesn't keep quiet. Then Vēdāntabhaṭṭa exhibits his knowledge in Philosophy to please his would-be-mother-in-law, which turns funny. His foolishness and innocence appear even in his philosophy and scholarship. Dissatisfied with learning the theory of Philosophy he wants to apply it in daily life. Leaving propriety to winds he quotes a proverb or an ancient saying in support of each and every sentence, either of his own or of others. Unfortunately, they showed the stupid he was.

When all the guests are ready to sit on a blanket, Ćandrikā rapidly pulls it away. But Vēdāntabhaṭṭa quotes-

तृणानि भूमिरुदकं वाक् चतुर्थी च सूनृता

By recollecting this, he congratulates Ćandrikā for her scholarship. Instead of supplying pure water Ćandrikā gives water

mixed with black peppers. Vēdāntabhaṭṭa without missing the occasion says

पयो दुर्लभमस्माकं तक्रं शक्रस्य दुर्लभम्

After observing both Vēdāntabhaṭṭa innocence and Ċandrikā's sharp tongue, the father promptly orders his son to keep his mouth shut. But as a sincere follower of Śāstra and Philosophy, he once again quotes. "विभूषणं मौन मपण्डितानाम्" and keeps silent for a moment. When Ċandrikā walks quickly he quotes 'धर्मस्य त्वरिता गतिः'. Similarly, all the foolish and inapplicable quotations of Vēdāntabhaṭṭa bestow plenty of comic.

A timely disclosure of the family priest of Vēdabhaṭṭa creates mirth like a simple satire. Being asked by Vēdabhaṭṭa to fix up a *Muhurta*, he says-

आगामिनि भौमवासरे मे कुतोऽप्यन्यत्र पौरोहित्यं नास्ति। तस्मिन् दिने भवतु।

Then Līlā enters and offers reverence to them all starting with the family priest, then Vēdāntabhaṭṭa quotes.

दुर्जनं प्रथमं वन्दे सज्जनन्तु ततः परम्

Ċandrikā asks about the educational qualification of Vēdāntabhaṭṭa which to our surprise were only the knowledge of Visnu Sahasra Naama and the study of Purusasukta. He is a scholar not only in literature but also in music. He sings a devotional lyric splitting the words improperly and all those gathered there laugh at him. See the song sung by Vedāntabhaṭṭa.

भवान् कुरङ्ग यतमं कै वल्य फलदायकम्।
न मापि माप कैशान पादर्प केरू हम्परम्॥
(भवाङ्करं गेयतमं कैवल्य फल दायकम्।)
नमामि मामकैशान पादपङ्केरूहं परम्॥)

In the third act, Ċandrikā quarrels even with her mother-in-law. The ironical statements and mockeries at that moment are brilliant.

For instance, when her mother-in-law was about to enter, Gautama hears the sounds of her sting for support and asks Ćandrikā किन्तत्? Immediately Ćandrikā replies.

एषा धर्मदेवता दर्शनं ददाति

The old lady, fed with the foolish quarrels between her son and daughter-in-law wants her funeral to be performed before Līlā's marriage. Then Gautama says- अम्ब किमेवमधर्म मन्त्रयसे. Ćandrikā then questions मातुरन्त्यकृत्यानुष्ठान मधर्मः किम् ?

This shows not only foolishness but also her intolerance and crookedness. She is even prepared to beat her mother-in-law.

The sixth act, the marriage scene again is like a separate *Prahasana*. Gautama arranges everything to give away Līlā to Vēdāntabhaṭṭa. Ćandrikā has already quit that house. Someone has taken away Līlā, but Gautama does not know it.

Gautama being angry with Ćandrikā and her absconding roughly says.

सा गर्दभी मत्ता भीता पलायिता

Immediately Vēdāntabhaṭṭa avails the chance and says.

गर्दभी गर्दभाद्भीता स्वयमेव पलायिता

But at the juncture Ćandrikā enters again.

सेयं शूर्पणखा नाम राक्षसी पुनरागता is the statement of Vedāntabhaṭṭa. All this provokes comic. Generally, a person's scholar-ship and nobility are measured by his conversation, but not so in the case of Vēdāntabhaṭṭa. Even after learning the fact that he will not marry Līlā, Vēdāntabhaṭṭa still says,

सन्यासस्य महाबाहो तत्त्वमिच्छामि वेदितुम्

On the other hand, comic based on context is also well evolved in this domestic comedy. The scene in which Gautama and Ćandrikā

simultaneously arrange the matrimony festival of Līlā with Vēdāntabhaṭṭa and Somila respectively is very much enjoyable. Both are side by side but Ćandrikā dominates her husband. As a result of it, all material though ordered by Gautama goes to Ćandrikā. Poor Vēdāntabhaṭṭa as usual exhibits his proficiency in Vedānta. Their chaplain proves the proverb what the abbot of Bamba cannot eat, he gives away as food to his soul and says skilfully as,

अस्माकं वरस्य शनिपीडापरिहारार्थं तत्सर्व दानत्वेन मन्यामहे

This timely delivery of the chaplain is very much entertaining.

Thus, top to bottom, Līlāvilāsa Prahasana is a monument of the sentimental comic proposed in various types of conversations. Family troubles, common in middle class families, are well represented in it. Converting the numberless tragedies into attractive comedies and with amusing incidents Mr. Sastry in the title page of this Prahasana named it as an original farce in seven acts, viewing only the Prahasana type of Sanskrit Literature.

ĆHALITĀDHAMARṆAM

It is a little *Prahasana* of Sri Abhrajendra Misra. Both the theme and the trend of comic are also very little and simple. Only the conclusion of the play which evokes lively humour places it among the domestic comedies.

Śiromaṇi is a householder. He settles his son's matrimony with a rich lady. But his son Asoka, a man with modern outlook, differs with his father. Then the tactful father cheats his son by pretending as if he has got a heart attack. Innocent Asoka feels sorry, and accepts to marry that rich lady, as fixed by his father.

Now-a-days every family is an intricated epic full of tragic and comic episodes, because of the differences between the younger and the older generations. The solution coming from this *Prahasana* is just personal but not common. O sons! beware of your fathers! They may cheat you with the motive of heart attack. But at the same time,

you should not feel it a joke if they really get such an attack. Only after knowing the cheating of Śiromaṇi, we laugh at him and therefore, the last turnup of this domestic comedy results in merriment. Conversations in colloquial Sanskrit are well maintained in this play, and it will be more attractive if performed by talented actors.

DHARITRĪPATI NIRVAÇANAM

This is a domestic comedy with farcical episodes written by Siddeswara Chattopadhyaya and published by Sanskrit Sahitya Parishad, Calcutta in 1971. Means of livelihood is the most predominant part in everybody's life. Fortune favours the bold. But the boldness or fortune of middle-class people is either too little or too much to deliver goods. Especially in the present social set up to get his daughter married to a suitable bridegroom is a major problem to any father. Dharitrīpati Nirvaçana Prahasana centralises such a problem, ie., selection of a bridegroom for his daughter by an inefficient and helpless father.

Bhagavān the father, daughter Dharitrī and his assistant Viśwakarma run a hotel. Customers often visit the hotel only to enjoy the beauty of young Dharitrī. Bhagavaan wants to earn something by all means and to settle down the marriage of Dharitrī. On that particular day he arranges a meeting with some young men to select a bridegroom.

The play begins with the entry of Bhagavān verifying his accounts and Viśwakarma sneering. Bhagavān., with his ears Plugged calls Viśwakarma many times, even after getting his replies. He grows angry and calls his servant, Badhira. This is the best joke we often enjoy with the deaf. The disparity between their condition and emotion provokes one to laugh at. Bhagavān prepares the list of the dues and orders Viśwakarma to collect that amount immediately after the entry of customers. He, then reveals the fact about the meeting, though Dharitrī and Viśwakarma dislike it.

Later Gaddolaka, Yuyudhāna, Laghuvançaka, Durandhara, Varaṇḍalambaka, Hayyangava enter one after another. All of them are in love with Dharitrī. Hayyangava is the uncle of Gaddolaka. Laghuvançaka is a landlord. Gaddolaka, Yuyudhāna and Laghuvançaka have had weapons like canes and hand sticks. All these arrogants rush towards Dharitrī impolitely. Each one beats the other black and blue. Viśwakarma keeps silent for a while but at last flings them away. Then Bhagavaan concludes with his statements aiming at the brutality and inhumanity of rich people.

Like modern one act plays, it starts with climax and ends with conclusion. Episodes and discourses are very familiar and interesting. For instance, see the dialogues between Bhagavaan and Viśwakarma.

भगवान् :- तत्र तव मस्तकमपि दत्त्वा सर्वं सुप्रसिद्ध कर्तव्यम्। रे मूर्ख ! ननु कथ्यते मया निर्वाचिता सभा।

विश्व :- निर्वाचन सभा ? अत्र भव पान्थशालायाम् ? कस्य निर्वाचनम्

भग :- पति निर्वाचनं रे गर्दभ पतिनिर्वाचनम्

विश्व: पतिः ! कस्य ?

भग :- तव (स्वगतम्) उन्मादं करिष्यति मामयं मूर्खः

विश्व :- मम। ननु भवान् किन्तर्हि अवसरं ग्रहीष्यति

We see a number of epigrammatic statements, which are too much exciting and attracting. For instance-

ऋणं खल्वाभिजात्यस्य कारणम्
अर्थप्रदाने कालक्षेप एव नीतिः

These very witty on one hand and on the other they are the ruined weapons of many people vanquished by the social and economic conditions. Such people are quite common and thus this one act play has a larger appeal.

Some dialogues often seen in this, are ravishing. Varaṇḍalambaka and Laghuvançaka rise to praise the beauty of Dharitrī at a time without giving scope to each other. The dialogues shuffled and reshuffled are very much attractive at the time of representation. For instance -

लघुः- रूपस्य गुणानां त्वा यस्या उपमानं जगति न विद्यते स एव.....

बरण्डः- स्वयं स्वहस्ते नैव.....

लघुः- कुसुम पेशलां स्वकीयां तनुमाहृत्य.....

वरण्डः- अत्र समागतान् सर्वान्.....

लघुः- सुकर मस्याः पान्थशालायाः.....

वरण्डः- सुमहता प्रयत्नेन.....

Thus, the domestic comedy elevating a middle class roadside hotel and representing some miserable situations and their consequences is a fascinating but lengthy domestic comedy.

SNUṢĀ VIJAYAM

Snuṣā Vijaya of Sundara Raja, son of Varadaraja, who has flourished in 19th century is a controversial *Prahasana*. Dr. V Ragavan has called it *Prahasana*. But Mr. Ramji Upadhyaya in his आधुनिक संस्कृत नाटक denies the opinion of Dr. V. Raghavan, saying that Snuṣā Vijaya is far from the comic episodes or comic elements, and classifying this as an *Añka*, a kind of Sanskrit drama referring to the definition of *Añka* given by Visvanatha in Sāhityadarpaṇa. But Snuṣā Vijaya can be considered a *Prahasana*, that too a Domestic comedy if not a comedy of humours. Suguṇa and Suçaritā are young couple signifying their names. Durāśā is the mother of Suguṇa and the mother-in-law of Suçaritā. She cares for none. Even her husband is unable to control her. Durāśā thinks that Suçaritā is trying to keep up Suguṇa in her grip, which she cannot tolerate. She does not at least allow her son to meet his wife at night even after the

completion of regular housework. Listen to Suguṇa himself saying about his mother in this connection

वधूजनः काङ्क्षति दुष्टचित्तो गर्भं स्नुषायाः स्सुरतं विनैव ।
आहार सम्पत्तिमहो विनैव शरीरपुष्टिं गृहकृत्य योग्यम् ॥

In her absurd fear of the love between Suguṇa and Suçaritā she tries to poison her son's thoughts by abusing the entire family of her daughter-in-law.

तस्याः पिता विदित एव पुरातिदुष्टः
मातापि दुर्मतिरिति प्रथिता पृथिव्याम् ।
भ्राता विटोऽथ भगिनी व्यभिचारिणीति
ख्याता न वेत्सि खलु तत्कुल मर्भक! त्वम् ॥

And she, very unkindly wants her son to imprison Suçaritā, and give her limited food with her own hands or with her daughter's hands. Read this -

तव क्वचित्सङ्कुचिते प्रदेशे निधाय दारानुदरान्तभृत्यै ।
धान्यं प्रदेयं प्रतिवासरं मे हस्तेन यद्वा मम पुत्रिकायाः ॥

At the end with the co-operation of Suguṇa and others, Suçaritā rules over her mother-in-law. The typical psychology of a mother in the role of a mother-in-law is the central point of the play. Such a cruelty which has spread over the society is not at all proper to any lady, especially to a mother. This disordered or improper behaviour of Durāśā and other similar characters give scope to comic and marks the Snuṣā Vijaya in *Prahasana* type of literature. This is a real domestic comedy associated with some tragic episodes to strengthen the value of the play.

Another domestic comedy of Pattabhirama Sastry of Calcutta University which was published in Sahitya Parishad Patrika, Calcutta in 1963 is नवोढा वधूः बरश्च, perhaps as an extension of 'Śukranīti'. There has been a saying in this country for times immemorial that telling a thousand lies to get a marriage performed is not at all a sin.

But in the present Prahasana नवोढा वधूः वरश्च only one lie is told. In other words, only one truth is kept hidden, and two youngsters Komalāñgi and Kṛṣna Kumār are married. Manjubhāṣiṇī mother of Komalāñgi always keeps her daughter away from her son-in-law. Kṛṣna Kumār could not tolerate their separation and so one dark night he embraces an old servant mistaking her for his better half. At the end Komalāñgi slowly exposes the truth that she is not fit for conjugal life.

UBHAYA RŪPAKAM

Disbelief, disagreement and disparity between a mother-in-law and a daughter-in-law are as old as the human race. Ubhaya Rūpaka of Mahalinga Sastry too shows the same aspect. Ubhaya Rūpaka in the words of Prof. M. Rama Krishna Bhatt, is a social satire. It is so, but it has the elements of a domestic comedy more than those of a social satire. This play deals with the family of Kukkuṭaswāmi with his wife, two sons and a daughter-in-law and a servant. The family of Kukkuṭaswāmi represents a Hindu joint family with its troubles and struggles with in. Kukkuṭaswāmi a cultivator is fond of civilized city life. His elder son Ċhandovṛtti dislikes city life and praises the country life. His wife is Ṡampā. Ċhāgala the younger son of Kukkuṭaswāmi has been studying in city and has been in love with a smart city damsel. Kukkuṭaswāmi settles another match without his son's knowledge and calls for his son.

Let us see the plot of the play completely, as it is very much interesting in the words of Mr. Ramakrisna Bhatt who has introduced the play.

"The farce opens with a conversation between Kukkuṭaswāmi and Vajra Ghosha. Ċhāgala the son of Kukkuṭaswāmi has come to his village from Madras where he studied. Vajraghoṣa a village teacher who has a finger in the pie wants to know why Ċhāgala, who generally spends his vacation in Pingalapuram has come to the village. Kukkuṭaswāmi informs him inter alia that his son being

accustomed to town life does not like to live in village. Still in deference for his desire he had come to spend the winter recess with him. Kukkuṭaswāmi is very proud of his son who has had English education and expresses his hope that he will go to England to live on the banks of the Thames for two years and come back and move about majestically holding some important government job. He does not like his elder son Ċhandovṛtti who lives with him in the village and toils in the fields. Ċhandovṛtti does not like so much love being showered on his younger brother by the father and so denounces an anglicised person in the presence of Vajra Ghoṣa. The father leaves the scene in deep *Dungeon*. After Ċhandovṛtti too leaves the place Ċhāgala comes in and in the course of a conversation learns from Vajraghoṣa that his father is carrying on negotiations with one Kāryadṛṣṭi for the marriage of the latter's daughter Vanċhana with him and that for this purpose the girl is being given lessons in music and English Language. Kukkuṭaswāmi wants that his sons would be father-in-law should bear the expenses of his foreign education. This disappoints Ċhāgala as he does not like to be married to a girl. He does not like simply for the sake of dowry. An interlude is called by mother to take tea. As he finishes it a post man delivers a letter from his professor Viśvāvasu Sarma by name, who wants him to join him at the Railway station and accompany him to Madras for making arrangements for the Inter-collegiate dramatic recitation competition to be held in the next week. From the Railway timetable he comes to know that the train reaches the Chagavata station at 11-30 a.m. As it is nearing 9 a.m. he hurries up to reach the station in time. But he discovers that he has not shaven. He says that there is only one barber in the wretched village who moves about from place to place owing to very little business. He then thinks that he should use his own shaving set. He tells his niece singing that he will have his bath in the river. He asks her to bring a little water in a bowl. When she delays, he looks round and finds Vṛddha Sakvara, the servant carrying a pot of water to the manager. He takes from it a little water in glass tumbler and asks the servant to stay outside the room until

he calls him again. He then shaves inside a closed room and puts the shaven hair on a piece of paper. He takes out another piece of paper on which is written the speech of his role in the drama Hamlet and which in the hurry he forgets to replace in his box. From Vṛddha Sakvara he learns that both his father and elder brother are away. He then folds the shaven hair into a packet and leaving it at the windowsill asks the old servant to take his trunk and bedding to the railway station. After a good deal of hesitation, the latter agrees and at the station Chāgala hands him a letter to be delivered to his father. In the meanwhile, the elder brother discovers the letter (i.e., Hamlet, speech) and raises a hue and cries to the effect, Chāgala has gone out to commit suicide. Consternation grips all the persons concerned and a number of people gather in the house. Vajraghoṣa goes to Chagala's room and discovers there in the packet and presumes that it contains some wet dark powder. Kukkuṭa takes it to be poison. Pippalī, Chāgala's mother is grief stricken to note that her son took poison to commit suicide. The village physician Sindhūraka is called to examine the contents of the Packet. He declares it to be a strong poison meant for the worst type of leprosy. Ṣhandovṛtti however puts the contents of the packet into water and discovers that it is the shaven hair and not poison. At this stage comes hurrying up Vrddha Sakvara with a letter in hand. That solves the mystery. The servant informs everyone present that Chagala is alright and has left by train for Madras along with his teacher. The letter tells the father that Chagala is sorry for his sudden departure from the village. He says that he does not like village life. He makes it clear that he does not want to marry a girl chosen by someone else. On the other hand, he would like to marry a girl who is his classmate and who loves him. Now this is a bolt from the blue to Kukkuṭaswāmi whose entire plan is upset. Vichāradṛṣṭi son of Kanyādṛṣṭi and a college mate of Chagala unravels the mystery by exploiting the earlier letter contains the monologue of the sad hero in the Shakespearian play Hamlet and that it is possible that the piece of paper slipped while Chagala was hurrying up to leave. He further explains that in the

original text. The name of the heroine is Ophelia but Chagala has put Manjula in its place, Chagala goes to Pingalapura to spend his vacation because of who is the niece of Viśvāvasu Sarma and whose father is an officer in the Military audit department in Pingalapura, concludes saying that why Viśvāvasu does not want Chagala to stay with his father even for a day. Kukkuṭa is very sad. Vajraghoṣa then advises him to treat his elder son and his wife with kindness and not look down upon them in his bride for a son whose real character he has now understood. Kukkuṭa realises his mistake and really repents"

In this play Pippali represents a typical mother-in-law and Sampaa a typical daughter in-law. The comic based on the dialogues is very fantastic. The character of Sindhūraka, an unregistered village doctor is humorous and runs like a delightful episode. Mockery used in this play gives pleasant humour.

The epilogue itself consists of some comic dialogues. See the discourse between *Sūtradhāra* and *Vidūṣaka*.

सूत्र :- किं तावत्ते गोत्र नाम

विदू :- तत्खल्वभिवादन वाक्ये पठ्यते

सूत्र :- तदेव पृच्छामि

विदू : (सरोषम्) कथमङ्गान् पृष्टः कलिङ्गनुपक्षिपसि । अतः परं सन्ध्यावन्दनमपि पृच्छसीति मन्ये । (पुनस्सानुनयम्) भवतु यत्सत्यं चिराय वृद्धाभिवादन विच्छेदात् अभिवादन क्रम एव मया विस्मृतः

सूत्र :- सन्ध्यावन्दने का कथा

Kukkuṭaswāmi being fond of city life supports hair clipping before Vajraghoṣa like this.

स्नात्या सद्यः परिहित शिरश्शारकेनादिनान्ता
च्छेत्या द्दोषः प्रभवति मुहुस्तेन केशा निकृत्ताः ।
एतन्मात्रेपि च कलकलस्तन्यते चेद्भवद्भिः
धिग्ब्राह्मण्यं धिगपि भवतां मन्दवीर्यां मनीषाम् ॥

This is really the trump card to support hair clipping. Ridiculous and funny quarrels between mother-in-law and daughter-in-law place this play in the list of domestic comedies.

Similarly, Nanāvitādana of Siddhēśwara Ćaṭṭopādhyāya; Ćāmuṇḍā, and Nipuṇikā of K.L.V.Sastry; Śaṅkara Vivāha of Viśwēśwara; Hā Hanta Śāradē of Skanda Śaṅkara Khot and Antyēṣṭi Samskāra, a work rendered from Bengali of Ravindranatha Tagore of K. Kamala are also domestic comedies.

SATIRE

To define Satire in brief Dr. Johnson says. "Satire is a poem in which wickedness or folly is censured".[18] It may be applied to persons, traditions or customs of the contemporary society. But it "is always acutely conscious of the difference between what things are and what they ought to be"[19]. So, the Satirist must be aware of what he wants to convey to his readers or audience and how to convince them.

Minor defects in one's blood are not seen externally. But if the blood is completely spoiled, the body becomes unhealthy which is visible externally. Then a clever doctor finds out the defects in the blood after proper diagnosis and purifies it through suitable medicines. The same procedure is applicable in the case of a satire and satirist. By studying a section of the society, the satirist finds out its defects and tries to rejuvenate its decaying health. Thus "the satirist is performing a socially and morally useful task of universal validity".[20] But in doing so, the satirist has to choose a suitable weapon like hyperbole or Sarcastic praise or sometimes understatement. The satirist may use fables with beasts as characters, Theophrastian characters. dramatic incidents, factional experiences, antidotes, proverbs and homilies. He may use invective, sarcasm, irony, mockery, raillery, exaggeration, understatement, wit in any one of its forms and any other thing to make the object of attack abhorrent and detestable.

Irony, Sarcasm and Satire - all are used to stir the audience. They subject the audience to introspection and do something constructive to purge the society of the exposed evils. In brief, satire is the principal method; Irony and Sarcasm are subordinate These two are based on figurative speech, but satire has its own importance and treatment. Therefore, Sarcasm and Irony and Satire ought to be associated with one another. Religion, hypocrisy, affectations, discrepancy between profession and practice, misinterpretations of theories are the immediate subjects that can be satirised,

A Satirist has another responsibility. He has not only to project the defects of the society but to find out means to them. Anyone can show a problem. The world is full of them. But a committed writer

should sincerely endeavour to solve them. Otherwise, he remains just another cheat. The satirist who discharges these duties sincerely is the real satirist.

Another important point is that the satirist must attack the evil in the society not the persons who do evil deeds. It appears to be paradox; but if a satirist hates people; he fails to understand the problem at hand and then he cannot justify his mission. That is why Jaffery says, "Satire should not be like a saw, but a sword, it should cut but not mangle."[21]

SVARGĪYA HASANA PRAHASANAM

Now-a-days, poets having social awareness do not keep quiet without giving at a dig at the present politics. Some of them even go to the extent of tearing the corrupt politics into pies. Even since we have got independence, many politicians became selfish, corrupt and immoral. They ceased to think about the country and began to think themselves. Money and muscle replaced truth and justice.

Svargīya hasana Prahasana of Siddheswara Chattopadhaya is a perfect satire pointing out the defects of politicians. All the mean and cheap political stunts of the world are satirised as if they are happening in the court of Indra in heaven. In the interlude of this prahasana, the poet discloses as 'स्वर्गे लोके वसतिमधुना राजनीती रवाप्ता'

All the political circumstances are distinctly visible when metaphorically expressed and that is why the poet has created such a plot.

Indra is the king of the paradise, but democracy prevails there. Bṛhaspati is his chief minister. Varuṇa is a fellow minister. Bṛhaspati holds many of the portfolios. Ashoka and Akbar are elected from the constituencies of 'Swarga'. Dhundhu and Punga are elected from 'Naraka'. Aditi is the ministress for self-development. Urvasi is just a legislator. They are the characters in this satire. But Varuna is off stage and merely mentioned.

The whole theme is based on Bṛhaspati who is too old to uplift the 'Vajra'. But his eyes fall on the throne. He allures Akbar and Ashoka with ministerships and gets their support. Aditi dislikes all this nuisance. For her, the Parliament Hall is the most comfortable place to have a sound sleep. But Ūravaśi works against Bṛhaspati with the support of Dhundhu and punga. She cuts a paper from Bṛahaspati's diary for evidence.

They move no confidence motion in the Parliament against Indra, though they have no majority. Indra abdicates his throne. Ashoka and Akbar propose and support Bṛhaspati for the rank of the king of the heaven. According to the demand of the Parliamentarians he uplifts the Vajra and then becomes the king of the heaven. But within no time Dhundhu and Punga forcibly pull-down Briḥaspati and once for all Indra becomes the king of heaven. At last, the conspiracy of Brihaspati comes out and Indra removes him from his ministry. This is the plot of this Satire.

Treatment of this plot is very interesting. All the Satiric arrows are feathered with wit and welded with sense. When Dēvarāja gives a statement as the notion of Parliamentarians about himself as-

सर्वतो रूद्ध प्रसरोऽयं देवराजः। निर्धार्यते सर्वं मन्त्रि परिषदा। तत्र स्वनाम लेखनमेव तस्य कर्मेति

We are at once be reminded of the common opinion of our people of some of the Indian Politicians and we laugh at it. Bṛhaspati recites some political principles and points out many defects even in the written constitution and asks for amendments of certain sections of rules. In India now we can see a large number of Bṛhaspaties who talk in this manner just to fulfil their selfish ends. He represents the personalities who pollute Indian Politics and political parties. Bṛhaspati follows the "Divide and Rule policy" which has been in practice for many years in our country to move a no confidence motion against Indra. These unprincipled and ridiculous practices provoke laughter.

The character of Aditi is peculiarly impressive. Even at the peak of discussions in Parliament, she would be sleeping. Getting up, at times, she talks some non-sense. As pointed out by some others, she tries to defend her behaviour vainly like,

परं निद्रा न मम आज्ञाकरी

It reminds us of some funny Parliamentarians who open their mouths only twice during their scheduled period as a member of Parliament, first to take an oath and then whenever they yawn.

The scene of Bṛhaspati uplifting the Vajra to become the king of heaven is derisive, as well as funny. The poet shows members passing time in parliament on unnecessary and useless discussions. Indirectly this satire exposes the present corrupt politics, with a mild dig and the treatment entertains the readers. Incredible exaggeration and vulgarity are not seen in this as it is intended mainly to satirise the contemporary politics.

'ATHA KIM'

Another satire of Siddheswara Chattopadhyaya projecting the non-political vices of contemporary society is Atha kim. He begins his satire, satirizing the existing satirical comedies by saying.

हास्यच्छलेन कुत्रापि प्रश्न एवोपस्थाप्यते । न ज्ञायते वा किमुत्तरमस्य । सर्वैरेव वा ज्ञायते तत् ॥

In the prologue he states the radical aims of the extremists of current society,

पुरातनं यात्वधुना विनाशं नवीन मद्येह विभातु काममम् ॥

All the characters belong to middle class families. No character is given any particular name, but all are called with Alphabets. A lady lower-divisional clerk; a poor man labouring hard for a square meal; a man just looking at things like 'Karma Sākṣi'; a politician seeking votes, with a wonderful promise to issue certificates to students without conducting examinations; another person not willing to cast his vote in favour of any of the parties; a revolutionary

who has great expectations of the new generation; a teacher and his shrewish wife are the characters. It does not have any particular plot. Only do we find conversations on certain national and social problems. The dialogues are just normal. It may be the aim of Siddheswara to represent the persons and the present-day problems as they are, without arriving at any conclusion. At last, they decide to wait for something new, which can solve all problems and form a committee to discuss the responsibilities of every individual.

Everyone announces his membership voluntarily in that committee. Everyone wants to deliver speeches sense or nonsense. Then the teacher encouraged by his wife begins to speak as if he is in his classroom. He recites the verse of Kalidasa and the Sutras of Panini etc. How ever the meeting ends up in a Pandemonium.

Verbal arrows with barbed satire are flung at one another in this Prahasana. The non-sense between 'Ka' and 'A' is ridiculous. सभायां सर्वं भवत्ति विना तु निर्णयम etc, statements are direct attacks on the society. The concluding verse:

कालस्य गतिमालोच्च साम्प्रतं प्रार्थयामहे ।
अस्तु मे मङ्गलं नित्यं भवतामस्तु वा न वा ॥

proves the indecency and selfishness of human beings, especially of the current society and hence laughable. But, it could not create curiosity like Svargīya Hasana Prahasana due to a weak plot up to the end of the first half of the play. All the characters lack unity of design. However, this Prahasana has dealt with important points and may be effectively performed by talented artists.

INDRAJĀLAM:

This is one of the most successful satires written by Abhirajendra Misra pointing out the defects of the society and ridiculing them. He has selected an up-to-date theme, closely associated with the society but neglected by most of the contemporary writers. Moreover, in

presenting the plot and characters, the author has maintained a high sense of propriety needed for a satire.

Though six characters are presented on the stage, only two characters take part in discourses. Rest of the characters are just on the stage to motivate conversation between the other two. The play of a roadside juggler and his assistant, is the main theme of the satire. A little boy covered with a block cloth explains and comments on the personalities of four persons in an ironical manner. All the above four characters are broken bones of this society. At last, he concludes his show talking about himself and his profession. He calls his profession an art; he is not an impostor or a beggar.

This satire is a fountain head of comic based on sound, sense and substance. Irony, mockery and ridicule are well advanced in this satire.

At the very begenning of this satire, the juggler invites people to enjoy his magic. In addressing them he starts with आगच्छ भगिनि आगच्छ भ्रातः and step by step, he invites the dogs also passing by.

The unexpected diversion in his addressing and the uncommon proceedings of his show rejoice the spectators. Treating human beings on par with dogs is also a fantastic irony and shows the bad state of the society. He addresses all Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs etc., in relation to their own religions. His comments as मशकावमर्दन मितोऽयं करतालध्वनिः etc., are witty. At the very beginning of the play of jugglery, the argument between the juggler and his assistant creates humour based on both the sound and sense. See-

ऐन्द्र:- एहि मम प्रियवटो

बालक :-अपेहि मम अप्रिय पटो !

ऐन्द्र:- कथं रूष्टोऽसि बालक !

बालक:- कथ मतुष्टोऽस्मि प्राणहारक ।

ऐन्द्र:- उपसर भोः क्रीडाशुक ।

बालक :- अपसर भोः गरलमुख ।

ऐन्द्र :- स्फूर्जय मे केलिविलास विहङ्ग !

बालक :- कूर्दय मे वेलित पलाशप्लवङ्ग ।

ऐन्द्र :- बान्धवाः दृष्टं भवद्भिः । अयं पादताडितकोऽपि न संशृणुते । सर्रथा कुटिलमसमञ्जसञ्ओत्तरयति बोतरयति । किङ्करवाण्यहम् ?

बालक:- (उच्चैस्वरेण) गुरो ! अस्य लुञ्चितस्य मुखे कुण्डलिनीः प्रवेश्य निरन्तरालम् ।

After putting an end to this internal dispute, they begin to perform their play. At the same time the poet starts satirising the society with funny words. Showing a stingy business magnet, the juggler asks his assistant in black mask to tell about him. In reply, his assistant declares him as follows to create mirth.

अयं विधिनिर्माणदृष्ट्या पुरुषः । पौरूष दृष्टया नारी । नारीत्व दृष्टया वन्द्या च ।

A politician comes next. Immediately the assistant spells out astonishing humour by just splitting his master's words.

ऐन्द्र :- तर्हि सत्यं भण किमयं समता शिक्षकः ।

बालक :- सत्यं भणामि गुरो ! अयं जनताभक्षकः ।

ऐन्द्र :- हंहोज्ञातम् । महानुभावोऽयं M.L.A. भूतः ।

बालक :- सुष्ठु विजानासि भवान् । बकशाबको यमालये प्रसूतः ।

The defects in modern style of living and fashions are Projected well, through a college girl wearing pants and shirt like a young man. Then the juggler requests his assistant to pick up five great persons from that crowd. The boy promptly selects a smuggler, a lawyer, a lecturer working at the University and a contractor for first instance and describes many vices in their routine course of lives with failures and flaws and their irresponsible behaviour towards the

society, in a captivating manner by which even the affected too cannot but laugh at themselves. To show the fifth great man, the boy removes his cover and presents himself. This is certainly an unexpected turn which imparts wonderful animation in the spectators. He withstands on his point by explaining like this-

अये महापुरुषा महद्भ्योऽपि महीयांसः विद्वद्वरेण्याः राज्यनेतारः समाजसंरक्षकाः श्रेष्ठवर्याः कलाकाराः आबालवृद्धाश्च जनसमूहाः रूपसौन्दर्य निधानभूताः सुन्दरे कामिन्यः यस्य मम पिपीलिकोपमस्य क्षुद्र जीवस्य वाचोयुक्त्या विमोहिताः सन्तस्तिष्ठन्ति अत्र क्षेत्र पुरुषायमाणाः सोऽहमिन्द्रजालवटुः कि नास्मि महापुरूषः ।

The suspense created by him in coming out by him-self is very naive and attractive. After that he prays to his spectators to help him for his livelihood. His words are so effective that the audience shower sympathy on him.

In fine 'Indrajālam' is one of the best and magnificent satires. Even the humour evolved in it, is neither vulgar nor indecent but pure, with unadorned simple wit and humour. We have to thank Mr. Rajendra Misra for not resorting to exaggeration of actions and movements.

VĒṢṬANA VYĀYŌGA PRHASANAM

It is a kind of satire composed by Virendra Kumara Bhattacharya and published by Sanskrit Parishad, Calcutta in 1971.

Now-a-days trade unionism appears to be a blessing on one hand and a curse on the other. Its formation has become too extensive to control. Caste, tribe, community, profession, business and even art cannot escape its vicious grip. These unions are struggling only to protect their rights, to fulfil their demands and desires but not to be united in discharging their duties. Every subordinate tries to throw the responsibility on his superior. Even the union leaders feel that it is the responsibility of higher authorities to make one to be devoted to one's duties. The goal of the union seems to be to attack unjust or illegal incidents and fight against them. The gulf between the rulers

and the ruled gradually widens. Many a sub-ordinate feels that his superior is his sworn enemy. Similarly, the superiors feel most of their subordinates are irresponsibles and lazy lot. Consequently, disputes have become unavoidable. This sorry state of affairs has brought people to believe firmly that nothing can be achieved without strikes, gheraos, sometimes violence too. Based on this, Mr. Bhattacharya composed the satire Vēṣṭana Vyāyōga.

Though the poet names this 'Prahasana' by saying -

प्रहसन मिदं व्यायोगाख्यं रसं तनुते लघु

Hāsya has fallen short of our expectations. The satirist tries chiefly to focus his attention on the disputes between the industrialists and the workers and, for this reason he cannot give importance to humour. But the basic thought ascribing the Gherao, the weapon of 'Kalki' as incarnation of Lord Visnu invites laughter.

In the interlude of the Satire the poet sternly criticises the black-marketing and tells that lack of production is not at all the reason for deficit in commodities because one can get them by paying higher rate than the fixed price.

Sanjay, Abhijit, Satrajit, Arijit and Jayadratha are the extremists, working in an industry. Jayadratha, though not a believer in extremism has to follow his fellow workers aiming at the unity of workers, since majority decision is followed in Democracy.

All the workers rush to the manager and abuse the officers and the owners. The manager tries his best to convince them but in vain. All the workers use the weapon of Gherao and arrest the manager and his assistant and sing group songs happily.

Then enters a leader by name 'Kalki' talking about the success of their Gherao. Everybody bows down before 'Kalki' and applauds his weapon Gherao. Even the last verse of this satire is in praise of Gherao. Giving a minimum scope to Hāsa this play is highly satiric, ironic and successful.

VIDHI VIPARYĀSA PRAHASANAM:

Keeping aside the question whether God is the cause of creation or Evolution as science says, one fact remains significant that in almost all creatures there are the two sexes male and female. In this master design of the universe two sexes play a major role apart from procreating. Though it is accepted in principle that both sexes are equal and indispensable for the rotation of the 'Life Wheel', there are a number of incidents where this principle is flouted. History bristles with innumerable examples where the women were ruled with an iron hand, ill-treated, deprived of their liberty and crushed under the wheels of Juggernaut; mostly by men and in some cases by their own sex.

In 1944, to oppose the Hindu code bill there was an All-India Conference of Scholars and saints in which Vidhi Viparyāsa Prahasana was enacted In this satire Jīvanyāyathīrtha thinks it proper to be against the difference between men and women as it is natural and satirises the same.

Moreover, Jīvanyāyathīrtha points out the difference between precept and practice in this satire. As everyone knows preaching is easier than practice. The misunderstood customs and the misinterpreted theories of Indian philosophy and psychology are also satirized in this play.

Most parents prefer sons to daughters and have a tendency to consider a son superior to a daughter. Jīvanyāyathīrtha logically criticises this unjust thought. Read-

एको गर्भः स्नेहसन्दर्भ एकः बीजं तुल्यं किन्तु मूल्यं विभिन्नम्
पुत्रः प्राप्तस्तात सर्वस्वमानः पुत्री मूत्रीभाव मेतीव घृण्या ॥

There are many witty statements in this. The principles attributed bo Jambālajiny to equalise women with men are humorous. See

प्रलम्बकेशच्छेदन, वक्ष वेषक पट्टबन्धन, सगोत्र वर्णविवाह, विवाह बन्धविच्छेदन etc. are her principles for our refreshment.

A false logic of Vinōda Sundara approving all human beings to be men is also fantastic. See

पुरूष एवेदगं् सर्व यद्भूतं यच्च भव्यम् ।
भूतमध्ये मादृशां भाव्यमध्ये च त्वादृशां सन्निवेशः ॥

Śatavārṣika Prahasana, another work of the same author, was intended to be enacted on the occasion of Diamond Jubilee of Calcutta University. In this, he satirises modern science, the views of some modern scientists, its well influenced achievements and its results. At the end of this satire, he courageously says that if we could not control the rapid changes and developments in the utilisation of the atomic power, the entire world, will be destroyed (smashed) See-

क्रियते चेन्न यन्त्रीय विज्ञानस्य नियत्रंणम् ।
शतवर्षान्तरे पृथ्वी नूनं ध्वस्ता भविष्यति ॥

This final statement of Jīvanyāya sharply criticises various modern scientific tendencies. Everything in this creation is double edged. It is in our hands whether to cut a fruit or to cut the tree itself, with a knife. Likewise, the atomic power should also be utilised only for the sake of peace but not to smash the world into ashes. All the countries in the world are trying to preserve various atomic powers to save their countries. Everyone is afraid of everyone else, and we live in perpetual fear today.

ḌAMARUKA

Ḍamaruka of Ghanasyāma is a peculiar type of drama, which is perhaps the first and last of its kind. Either the author or his son Chandrasekhara, who wrote a commentary on his father's work does not call this a Prahasana. Instead, Chandrasekhara calls it Ċitrāvalī in the introductory verses of his commentary to Ḍamauraka. Even the modern critics have different opinions in deciding the nature of this work. Sri P Y. Ramanuja Swami in his introduction to Ḍamaruka says that "none of these characteristics is found in the present

work,", [22] But Sri Ramji Upadhyaya in आधुनिक संस्कृत नाटक accepts this a Prahasana with higher merits.[23] Therefore, it is controversial to admit Ḍamaruka in the school of Prahasana. But if one admits this, this will prove to be pure and fantastic direct satire dealing with many defects of Indian Society in a funny manner. There are some fragments of Parody also in this. There are ten 'Alankaras' (Scenes) including the prologue and prelude. The ten Alankaras are named as

राजानुरञ्जनम्, कलिदूषणम्, सुकवि सञ्जीवनम्, कुकवि सन्तापनम्, अबोधकर, शाब्दिकरञ्जनम्, पण्डित खण्डनम्, जातिसन्तर्जनम्, प्रभुत्वम् and अखण्डानन्दम्

There is neither unity of action nor scope for any action in this work.

In Rājānuranjana all the stanzas in which the embarrassment caused to the Gods, Brahma, Vishnu and Siva by the fame of a king is described, remind us of a similar one in the Pratāparudra Yaśōbhūṣaṇam of Vidyaanaatha[24]. This type of description in Rājānuranjana may be a parody to the entire literature with overflowing exaggerations like Prātaparudrīya etc. Read the following-

देव त्वद्यशसा सिते जगति यज्जातं तदाकर्ण्यतां
चित्रं हंस इति भ्रमाच्छतधृतिः काकोलमारोहति ।
तार्क्ष्यं भ्रान्ति वशंवदः समयते गृध्नं विकुण्ठासुतः
कञ्चित् कर्षति कासरं वृषधिया कण्ठे कलङ्को विभुः ॥

In the second scene Kalidūṣaṇa, the poet satirises many categories of people embarrassed at the evil nature of Kali. These unlawful practices are bluntly satirised and picturised for the sake of humour. For Example-

ग्रामे न विद्वान् जडता प्रभोश्च विश्वासिनी तस्य च धर्मपत्नी ।
इत्थं यदिस्या दखिलं तदानीं पुरोहितस्तत्र वृहस्पति स्स्यात् ॥

एकद्विपणदानेन हृष्टः कवितया पुनः ।
शैलं सिद्धार्थयेदादौ सिद्धार्थं शैलयेत्ततः ॥

But Ghanaṣyāma honours real poets who are dedicated and devoted to poetry. He venerates them whole heartedly. See one verse from Sukavi Sanjīvana.

क्व विहारः क्व चाहारः क्व निद्रा काङ्गनागतिः ।
कवित्व ब्रह्मणि परं सुसक्त श्चेन्महाकविः ॥

Especially the fourth and sixth Alankaras as namely कुकविसन्तापनम् and शाब्दिकभञ्जनम् are very humorous. In Kukavi Santāpana, he sharply and delicately satirises and mocks at the so-called poets, without poetic talent or excellence. He compares the bad poet to a Paramour.[25] He meets all poets pretending as if they are poets with extraordinary equipment like five or six pens, number of papers, two or three ink pots. See the verse

लेखिन्यः पञ्चषाः द्विन्राः पत्रिका द्वौ मषीघटौ ।
कवित्व ब्रह्मणि परं सुखक्त श्चेन्महाकविः ॥

In addition to the above, now-a-days we can see the so-called poets with files. These people compensating their lack of talent with show work provoke laughter. Ghanaṡyāma criticises another type of poet also, who with his one or two pieces of verse trying to appear as a great poet rendering the same in many languages and reading the same at all places with slight changes.[26] Moreover there are poets who have a right to copy other's thoughts. They steel other's thoughts or the entire verses but say that it is only "Samvāda" i.e., common thought (telepathy). See-

तुष्यत्यविदिते लोकैः कवित्वान्तर चोरणे ।
ज्ञाते संवाद एवेति मन्दं भणति दुष्कविः ॥

In the seventh scene namely पण्डितखण्डनम् the poet advocated the aggressive steps to be taken against grammar by dedicating the scene for the wrong grammatical usages. See a stanza-

वन्यं भक्ष्यति पीयतेच्छमपगानीरं पथा साधुना
स्वैरं सञ्चरते न जातु भजते नग्नोऽपि नान्यस्तुते ।

नो वा संश्वणुते न वा वचति नो सम्पश्यते नेहते
कुञ्चे विश्रमते तदेष सुमतिः शङ्केऽद्य रङ्कूयते ॥

It is not strange to find Ghanaśyāma who has severely criticised the poets prone to grammatical mistakes, committing the same mistakes in his verse because this is simply imitation.

Pāṇditya Tāṇḍavita Prahasana of Vaṭikānātha Śarma is also a simple satire which represents various attitudes of so-called scholars, who have made a name for themselves.

PARODY

Parody is a simple and supple comedy. It is an ironic imitation of a person, thing, custom, tradition, a work of art and so on. Imitation of sound is mimicry, whereas that of sense is parody. Even a great piece of art when parodied becomes funny and enjoyable. Thus, a flaw or defect that lay unnoticed hidden in the original comes out in a parody with a verve of humour. In spite of this explosion, both the parodist and the person subjected to parody do not feel hurt. It serves as a mirror. You don't find fault with your mirror, because it shows a white hair or two, or an unwelcome winkle around your eye. Do you?

Poetry, Plato said, is twice removed from truth. That way Parody is thrice removed. But the twice removed truth enlightens and entertains us. Similarly, the thrice removed parody exaggerates and diverts in a funny manner and tickles us. As it is just imitation it loses its naturality to a larger extent and therefore is comic oriented.

In Greek Literature there is a figure of speech by name Apostrophe. Parody and Apostrophe are related to each other.

"Apostrophe is a figure of speech, which consists in adorning a dead or absent person, an animal, a theory or an abstract quality or idea as if it were alive at present and capable of understanding. The use of Apostrophe gives life and immediacy to language but is also subject to abuse and open parody". [27]

Perhaps Parody might have been derived from apostrophe. Apostrophe has the nature of being utilised not only to create comic but to elevate persons and to project truth. But parody is well established in evolving laughter. An extensive state of parody is burlesque. Apostrophe - Parody - Burlesque may be the order of their transitional process.

"Parody was originally a song sung besides, i.e., a comic imitation of a serious poem. Imitation may be of the actual words or of the manner. The comic effect may be achieved by applying a high-flown

language or metre for trivial themes or by some other form of incongruity or caricature".[28] Though imitation of a serious poem is a parody, all types of imitations should not be brought into this cadre. The imitation becomes a parody when it is done intentionally aiming at the fulfilment of the comic with the help of irony and mockery. That is why many writers influenced by their predecessors are not parodists.

Parody is classified as critical or literary parody and comic parody. Imitation of a poet's style and approach is literary parody. In other words, it is a caricature. Comic parody relates with Burlesque which is the counterpart of the tragedy.

Three things are essential for a Parody:-

The original should have the grace to lend itself to be parodied; the parodist should do his job well, and it should be enjoyable tickling all over the body and mind too.

In Sanskrit Literature, especially in *Sravya* Literature, appearance of parody is hardly possible. Even in Sanskrit Drama, there are a few fragments of parody.

Hāsyaçūḍāmaṇi is the first Prahasana which lends itself to a good parody. In that, the author Vatsarāja proves, how one can create good comic with simple parodies only by altering one or two letters from the original and transforming a sublime imagination into a simple thought. Vatsarāja Parodies not only style but thought and modesty also.

In Hāsyaçuḍāmaṇi Prahasana a teacher namely Jnānarāśi teaches his disciple Kaunḍinya to recite as--

आलोक्य सर्वशास्त्राणि विचार्य च पुनः पुनः ।
इदमेकन्तु निष्पन्नं ध्येयो नारायण स्सदा ॥
नमस्ते पुण्डरीकाक्ष नमस्ते विश्वभावन ।
नमस्तेस्तु हृषीकेश महापुरुष पूर्वज ॥

Instead of this, Kaunḍinya makes it parodied as--

आलोक्य सर्वगात्राणि विचार्य च पुनः पुनः ।
इदमेकन्तु निष्पन्नं ध्येयो नारीजन स्सदा ।
नमस्ते पाण्डुरैकाक्ष नमस्ते विश्वतापन ।
नमस्तेस्तु मृषाकोश महापरुषकूर्चक ॥

In this Parody Kaunḍinya has transformed the glory of Nārāyaṇa to "Nārī Māhātmya" and the prayer of Lord Visnu to paint his teacher black by use of Malapropism. There is no harmony between thought and style. Due to this lack of balance, this parody creates laughter.

In Palānḍu Manḍana Prahasana of Harijivanamisra, there is a parody of Vedic Hymns. A rat, imagined as a creator is praised in it. If it is recited with Vedic accents, it surely sounds like Vedic Hymn-

मूषको वै प्रजापति रासीत् । तस्य द्वौ दन्तावास्ताम् । दन्तेन बिलं करोति । भाण्डं स्फोटयति । हविष्यान्नां भक्षयति..... चूं चूं शब्दं करोति । यजमानं स्वर्गलोकं गमयति । अवे वेद ॥

Traditionalists need not raise their eyebrows at this. The very aim of such parody is only to create humorous situations but not to disobey Vedas. An adept in wit must be able to laugh at himself.

Besides verses, one may Parody lyrics, degrading the thoughts developed in them. A cheerful parody of such type is seen in Kaunḍinya Prahasana. Kaundinya an abnormal glutton always yearned to be a guest anywhere and everywhere whether invited or otherwise. Disclosing his thoughts out, Mahalinga Sastry wrote a good parody, taking a well-known philosophical lyric of Sadasivabhrahmam as its original--

चिन्ता नास्ति किल तेषां चिन्ता नास्ति किल ॥
शमदमकरुणा सम्पूर्णानां साधुसमागम सङ्कीर्णानाम् ॥
परमहंस गुरुपदचित्तानां ब्रह्मानन्दामृत मत्तानाम् ॥ (Original)

See the Parody -

चिन्ता नास्ति किल तेषां चिन्ता नास्ति किल ।
परगृहभोजन परितुष्टानां नित्यातिथ्योत्सव निष्ठानाम् ॥

कालत्रयविरतोद्योगानां किञ्च समेताधिक भोगानाम् ॥
गृहमेधि निमंत्रण सक्तानां पड्रस भरिताशन मत्तानाम् ॥

This is a 'Kirtana' beginning with चिन्ता नास्ति किल which is in praise of the prophets. The first line of it is taken as it is, and the rest of the lyric is parodied. Here the original lyric foregoes its seriousness and becomes a piece of comic. "Nothing is unattainable if aimed perfectly", is the essence of that lyric and the same is proved by allowing that to a way of creating comedy through this comic parody.

In Palāṇḍu Maṇḍana Prahasana, as said previously, we see Vedic accents parodied where as in Līlāvilāsa Prahasana, the musical sounds are parodied. Music is a devotional gift, and it surpasses all barriers. But without a sound knowledge and taste for music, one cannot enjoy the bliss it imparts, but for the irregular splittings, non-sense words and unnecessary tunes. Musician generally adjusts the tone before beginning to sing. Seeing all this common people most probably parody Music, just by adjusting their tones, splitting the words wrongly and tuning unnecessarily. K.L.N. Sastry in Līlāvilāsa Prahasana shows such a parody. See-

भवान् - कुरङ्ग – यतमं – कै - वल्य - फलदायकम् ।
नमामि – माम - कैशान – पादप – ङ्के रूहें - परम् ॥

Sung like this instead of

भवाङ्कुरं गेयतमं कैवल्यफलदायकम् ।
नमामि मामकैशान पादपङ्केरूहं परम् ॥

This is a good example to show how a fool can spoil music and Lyric.

Let us see another example for parody from Līlāvilāsa Prahasana in which a change of one or two words distorts the meaning. In this Prahasana Gautama and Ṣandrikā are an ill-matched couple. They differ in all affairs under the sun. Ṣandrikā always wants to condemn her husband's views. See her parody to her husband's version-

दारिद्र्य योगाद्भजति श्रियं नरः
दारिद्र्य योगा दुपयाति संयमः ।
दारिद्र्य योगाल्लभते परम्पदं
दारिद्र्य योगाद्भवबन्धमोचनम् ॥

is the verse of Gautama. But Ćandrikā turns it as-

दारिद्र्य योगा त्यजति ह्रियं नरः
दारिद्र्य योगा दुपयाति तं यमः ।
दारिद्र्य योगा त्परपाद सेवनं
दारिद्र्य योगा त्परगेड भोजनम् ॥

This is the Parody of Ćandrikā. By examining these two, one can understand the importance of the knowledge of the original text in parody.

PRATĀPA RUDRA VIJAYAM

The second type of Parody is critical or literary parody which has not made its appearance in Sanskrit literature till recent years. Pratāpa Rudra Vijaya or Vidyānātha Viḍambana of Dr V. Raghavan is the first critical or literary parody in Sanskrit. It is a parody of the entire poetic style of Vidyānātha who has composed a drama in his Pratāparudra Yaśōbhūṣaṇa as an illustration of dramaturgy

In the preface of Pratāparudra Vijaya Dr. V. Raghavan has brought out his views in writing the parody. He points out the decadence of Sanskrit Literature, mocks the stereotyped figures and fancies, and ridicules the authors of the Panegyrical poems etc., He adds.

"The technique adopted is to extend further to the stock Rupakas, Parinamas, Bhrantimats, Utpreksas, Atisayokti and Atyukti and to make the imaginary world called up by these figures of poetry into actual facts, i.e., to put in the technical language of poetics to make the कवि प्रौढोक्ति निष्पन्न into लोकसिद्धवस्तु and work out the consequences of the same into a humorous theme",[29]

Vidyānātha, a recognised critic has composed Pratāparudra Yaśōbhūṣaṇa with all illustrations dedicated to Pratāparudra with many Atiśayōktis and Atyuktis and various absurd contexts. Parodying all the above Dr. Raghavan composed Pratāparudra Vijaya. This is a literary or critical parody which follows more closely a given authors style or a particular work of art.

This parody contains four acts, with intermediate *Viṣkambhas*. All these four acts are given individual names. Let us see the plot developed in these four acts.

In the first act "onslaught of the dust" of the Victorian army (नासीर पांसुधाटी) presents the effect of the huge dust raised by the marching army of Vīrarudra. The dust has actually pervaded the atmosphere and plunged the world in darkness suitable for all sorts of nocturnal activities in the city. Finally, it has invaded the heaven and produced absurd and calamitous events in the world of Indra and Sachi. The second act is "Advance of Darkness" (तमः प्रक्रम): The darkness has been the result of the sorrow of those who had been defeated or put into difficult situations by the great powers of Vīrarudra. This is described with reference to both the terrestrial and heavenly spheres. The III Act is called 'Asura Vijaya'. The triumph of Asuras who exploit the situation and seize Amarāvathi, Indra's consort and others. The IV Act entitled the 'परमेश्वर पट्टाभिषेक' or the coronation of Vīrarudra as the super lord in the capital of Gods themselves, the usual motif of a powerful ruler of the earth going up to the aid of Indra in difficulty in heaven.

Mātali, Indra's charioteer coming to take him and God Siva himself coming and blessing Vīrarudra's coronation are described. This is a humorous story, built out of many absurdities.

This Pratāpa Rudra Vijaya does not give any scope to vulgarity. Dr. Raghavan himself discloses in it in the prologue of this text. [30]

The huge dust raised by the marching army has pervaded the entire atmosphere and brought out a sudden darkness, resulting in

all sorts of nocturnal activities before time. At that time rats began to come out of their holes in thousands. See the absurdity and incongruity in deriving this-

किमिति कथयाम्याखुस्त्रीणां गृहेऽन्ध्रनृपतेः श्रियं
विपुल विवराभ्यन्तर्गोणीशताहित तण्डुलान् ।
गुडघृत घटान् माजरिशा स्सम्मीक्ष्य पलायिताः
अनुमितिरसाः स्वान् रक्षन्त स्स्तुवन्ति च पायसम् ॥

If one wants to praise a great person, there are many humble ways. But here the wealth of the Virtuous wives of rats is made use of to prove the bravery of Pratāparudra completely foregoing the decorum and therefore, remains comic oriented.

After this *Viṣkambha*, Saci and Indra enter the stage. This scene is wholly devoted to humour and comic based actions or movements. They begin to discuss the sudden twilight, and before they could realise, the dust falls into Saṣi's eyes. Indra impressed by Saṣi's beauty at that moment wants to kiss her. But soon he was shaken by sudden gusts of wind and thunder and dust falls into his thousand eyes. For the first time, he feels sorry for having a thousand eyes. Then he remembers Gautama and says-

अद्य पश्यामि गौतमस्य दृष्टि कौटिल्यम्

Both Indra and Saci become blind and run away. Unfortunately, Saṣi falls into a swimming pool. Its water muddy due to the dust raised by the marching army of Vīrarudra. This scene evokes laughter in the audience.

In the second act, again, we have comic based on uncommon thoughts. Vīrarudra drives away his enemies from their kingdoms and they flee to forests in crowds. That makes a great loss to the sages there and they have been in search of their regular diet also. Some of the kings eat fruits, some others grass, and the rest were unable to get even that. Giving the reason for not arresting them, the poet says

जिष्णुश्रीवीररुद्र प्रमथितधरणी पालवन्द्याङ्गनानां
भूरिश्वासोष्मवातैरधिक मभिहतेष्वस्फुटद्भित्तिकेषु ।
कारावासेषु तत्तलवनवरचना व्यग्रिता वेश्मकाराः
तांस्तान् हन्त स्ववृत्तिं विजहति च दिशो बिद्रवन्त्यन्ध्रपुर्याम् ॥

This hyperbole is really funny. At this juncture dust and darkness envelop the entire universe but demons, exploiting this emerge and carry away Saṣi. They invade Amarāvathi. Then Bṛhaspati promptly admits their inability and says परिचितं पलायनमपि दुस्साधं भवति, which proves their permanent low spiritedness and refreshes the spectators.

In Amarāvathi everybody is vigilant. Then enters Nārada and orders Mātali to bring Vīrarudra to heaven by order of Lord Siva. Giving the address and identification marks of Vīrarudra as well as his capital, Nārada says-

देवो भूतपतिस्स्वयं गणयतः पुत्रं कुमारं प्रियं
पार्वत्यश्रुभिरार्द्रितेषु हिमवत्प्रान्तेष्वमृग्यच्चिरम् ।
शून्योराश्च स्पृशन् रमापतिरागात् गलानिं विधातापि च
स्वास्यं वीक्ष्य सरस्वती विरहितं जाडंय समालम्बत ॥

This hyperbole enlightens that Vīrarudra is the incarnation of Kumara Swamy, Laksmi and Saraswati. And also in the above verse is a nice joke. In this connection Dr. Raghavan Parodies Logic पार्वत्यश्रुभिराद्रितेषु हिमवत्प्रान्तेषु i.e, Tarkaśāstra in giving the true identification of Vīrarudra. Every definition given by Nārada becomes 'Ativyāpta' and therefore unavoidably Nārada has to accept तत्भिन्नत्व निदेशनम्. (defining with exemption) and says एतादृशं पशुपति पदमपहाय स्थानमपरं यदद्रौ तदेव वीररुद्रस्थानम्.

Then all the warriors of Indra mistaking one another to be their enemies kick the ground and move away. This contextual comic is delightful. Then enters Pratāparudra, whose bravery has been imagined variously by the warriors of Indra. What a bad luck for Indra, after seeing the thunderlight of Pratāparudra's bravery some of his eyes once again become blind. Mistaking it to be a monster tidal wave, they hurry in search of Agastya. All of them meet

together. At the same time, a red light pervades the entire city again. They feel that it is an evil shadow, a bad omen predicting difficulties. But a good event follows it -

नन्दनवनगताः अप्सरोविलासिन्यः अस्मद्भक्तस्य वीररुद्रस्य पराक्रमयशो वशीकृत स्वान्ताः तं प्रति प्रकटयन्ति अनुरागम्।

This is Atyukti. This terrific Atyukti, based on Poetic convention is not at all seen anywhere except in comic. Love may have certain tinge of red, but will not be wholly coloured red. Brhaspati imitates an untalented orator on a dais, when Śiva wants him, with his cough, adjustments of the tone, trembling etc. to praise the glory of Vīrarudra.[31]

Last but not the least is Dr. Raghavan wants to parody the entire style of Vidyānātha at the end of the parody and writes a verse completely following his style. For instance,

ससेवा हेवाक प्रतिभटमहीपाल निकर
स्फुरत्कोटीराढ्य प्रसृमर महारत्न निवहैः
ज्वलद्भानुव्यूहैः स्नपित मरिराजन्यकमनो
नभोभूजत्पाद द्वयमुदय हेतोर्भवतु नः ॥

Totally this is a right literary parody or the only literally parody so far in literature satirising the style and thought of Vidyānātha.

KAVI SAMMELANA PRAMASANA

Kavisammēlana of Sri Viswanatha Misra, belonging to Bikaner has been published in Bharati (Sanskrit Monthly) in November 1970. It is a marvellous parody, but very simple both in style and length representing the get-together of poets in contemporary society, satirising and moralising human weaknesses and silly tendencies.

The play begins with the welcome song sung by the youth in praise of उद्घाटनाचार्य who is present there to deliver an inaugural speech. After the inaugural speech of Mr. उद्घाटनाचार्य Rasikaranjana Bhattacharya of Bengal who has enriched the literature with his "Gentleman

Mimamsa", Bhujana Bhushana of Assam, who has composed the "चाय स्मृतिः", Bhojamani Sastry, the author of गुरुशिष्य संहिता and Kesava Kisorakavi, the compiler of Kursi Kaumudi (कुर्सी कौमुदी) take part in the conference.

All the incidents, characters and poets participated in the conference and the poetry read by them and the play itself compile an amazing parody, hand in hand with satire

What उद्घाटनाचार्य says in his inaugural speech is a direct satire upon the contemporary social habits. Read-

युगोऽयमस्ति उद्घाटनस्य । सर्वस्यापि वस्तुनः कार्यस्य च उद्घाटनं कर्तव्यमेव । यदि उद्घाटयितुं किमपि न मिलेत् तदा मकानस्योद्घाटनं, दुकानस्योद्घाटनंम, दरवाजायाः, स्विडकेश्चोद्घाटनं कर्तव्यम्

We see many people, now-a-days having the same idea and psychological feelings as that of Mr. उद्घाटनाचार्य. These persons appear to follow socialism as they are impartial in opening big or small functions; concerned or unconcerned; and proper or improper and their behaviour invites laughter. He concludes with a parody to a verse in Kaṭhopaniṣad like this.

अणोरणीयो महतो महीयः
पुण्यं यद्दास्य मुद्घाटनं सदा ।
सर्वैः प्रशस्यं भुवि वन्दनीयं
संसारव्याप्तं वय माचरामः ।

Viswanatha makes use of many Sanskrit texts to write parodies. He follows Raamaayana Bhartrhari Subhaasita, Meghasandesa and many other well-known stanzas of moral dispensary. For our amusement, the poet utilises Hindi also amidst Sanskrit words and lines.

In the Gentleman Mimaamsa, Viswanatha makes parodies as follows.

धर्म एव हतो हन्ति धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः ।
तस्माद्धर्मो न हन्तव्यः मानो धर्मो हतोऽवधीत् ॥

is the well-known stanza of Manu. Viswanatha takes that and attributes it to the ever-altering fashions of current society like this

फैशनन्तु हतं हन्ति फैशन रक्षति रक्षितम्
फैशनं नैव हन्तव्यं मा नो फैशन हतोऽवधीत् ॥

When you enter a hotel your reception warm or cold depends on how you have dressed and how you look. Observing this very simple point, Viswanatha Misra composes the following-

स्वदेशे पूज्यते कश्चित् सभामध्ये तु पण्डितः ।
सङ्ग्रामे पूज्यते कश्चित् जण्टिल्मेनस्तु होटले ॥

I don't think it necessary to recall the original verse. Yet it is here;

स्वगृहे पूज्यते मूर्खः स्वग्रामे पुज्यते प्रभुः ।
स्वदेशे पुज्यते राजा विद्वान् सर्वत्र पूज्यते ॥

His parodies to Bhartṛhari are astonishing. Bhartṛhari denoting the highness of the education says as

विद्या नाम नरस्य रूप मधिकं प्रच्छन्न गुप्तं धनं
विद्या भोगकरी यशस्सुखकगी विद्या गुरुणां गुरुः ।
विद्या बन्धुजनो विदेशगमने विद्या परा देवता
विद्या राजसुपूजिता न तु धनं विद्याविहीनः पशुः ॥

Viswanatha elevating the highness of a chair or designation follows that like -

कुर्सी नाम नरस्य रूपमधिक प्रच्छन्नगुप्तं धनं
कुर्सी भोगकरी यशस्सुखरी कुर्सीगुरूणां गुरुः ।
कुर्सी बन्धुजनो विदेशगमने कुर्सी परा देवता
कुर्सी लोक सुपूजिता न तु धनं कुर्सीविहीनः पशूः ॥

It is an open secret that the designation has more charm than the knowledge that goes with it, and educational values are dying a slow death. Therefore Viswanatha, for our amusement has replaced कुर्सी (chair) for education. We see people not having the minimum

knowledge but trying to look superior with an unhealthy ego. Observing it, the poet takes the famous verse of Bhartṛhari[32] and replaces some Hindi and English words for Sanskrit and Parodies like the following

मिला थोडा ज्ञानं गजइव मदान्धरसमभवं
समस्ते लोकेऽस्मिन् नहि नहि कोई समानो मम इति ।
गया डयूटी करने क्वचिदपि सभयायान्तु सुधियां
तदासौ जानाति मर्कटसमो जेण्टिलमेनः ॥

In writing "चायस्मृतिः" the poet follows the style and tune of Vedic hymns. At the same time, he follows both Valmiki and Jagannatha. It sounds funny that none can control his lips and heart running towards smiles and laughs. See this-

चाय इति मन्त्रस्य लिप्टन् ऋषिः । शर्करा छन्दः । स्टोव् देवता । दुग्धं बीजम् । प्लेटकं कीलकम् । क्षुधा निद्रा निवृत्त्यर्थं, भ्रष्टाचार सिद्यधर्थं चायपाने विनियोगः । अथ माहारम्यम् -

नाहं वसामि वैकुण्ठे योगिनां हृदये न च ।
मद्भक्ताः चाय्सुकुर्वन्ति तत्र तिष्ठामि होटले ||[33]

Last but not the least, Kavisammēlana is a little but effective Prahasana. It satirises many contemporary follies of Indian Society and entertain even the persons who are satirised.

MISCELLANEOUS TYPES OF PRAHASANA

Some miscellaneous types of comedy are being dealt with in this chapter.

Dāmaka Prahasana is a unique play which could not be treated under any particular type of comedy. It has nothing to do with the qualitative comic.

Though there is no ample proof to say that Dāmaka Prahasana is the work of Bhāsa, sone scholars have attributed the authorship to him conclusively. V. Venkatrama Sastry who has edited, and rendered Dāmaka Prahasana into English has said in his preface that Mr. Manavalli Ramakrishna Kavi had called Dāmaka Prahasana as the fourteenth play of Bhāsa in his lecture at the oriental conference held in Madras. So Mr. Venkatrama Sastry tried to support Manavalli Kavi saying "in matter and diction and phraseology and plan, it bears a companionship to the thirteen works of Bhāsa and to Bhagavadajjuka, Mattavilāsa Prahasana and Kalyāṇa Saugandhika".[34] Not only these but there are some other reasons like *Nāndi* ritual in *Pūrvaranga*, the term *Sthāpana* substituted for '*Prastāvana*' and the lack of particulars of either of the poet or of the play in 'Prastāvana'. Taking these reasons into account, Dr Veerabala Sarma in संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक has decided that Dāmaka Prahasana is the contribution of Bhāsa and might have been composed when the author was young.[35]

But this may not be the work of Bhāsa. There is no necessity of attributing this work to him for most of the dialogues in this text are being seen in Avimāraka, Ṣārudatta Svapnavāsavadatta, Karṇabhāra of Bhāsa and Mattavilāsa Prahasana of Mahendra Vikrama Varma. There are only four verses in this text. Out of these four, one is taken from 'Artha Sāstra' one from Kumāra Sambhava and the third from Karṇabhāra partly. This simple work looks like a selection of scenes or half scenes containing verses called from well-known writers and compiled for some kind of diversion.

At the very beginning of the play after the prelude Dāmaka, a jester enters and exposes his grievances on the model of the jester in Abhijnāna Śakuntala, Ćārudatta and Svapna Vaasavadatta. He holds at times some of their dialogues too. This Dāmaka alone occupies more than two thirds of the play. This is followed by Karna's learning the archery at the feet of Paraśurāma and its consequences.

Though this is a one act play, it does not admit the rules and regulations of the one act plays in Sanskrit dramaturgy. Twice all the characters go off the stage at a time. This play is named neither after the hero nor after the fruit of the theme. All the characters irrespective of their status speak only Sanskrit. Perhaps this Dāmaka Prahasana is just compilation of pieces from various textbooks, by some unknown person making use of his poor scholarship, derived by a desultory study of certain Sanskrit words.

Here are the few dialogues where we can find some set of humour in the Prahasana.

तथाप्येकः खलु महान् दोषः। ममाहारः सुष्ठु न परिणमति । सुप्रच्छदनायां शय्यायामपि निद्रां न लभे। मया च महाराजः सपट्टन शीर्षेण अनुवन्द्य विज्ञप्तः नाहमनुगच्छामि महाराजमिति...

मम बुदिश्चेदानीं मादर्शमण्डलगता छायेव वामेषु दक्षिणा दक्षिणेषु वामा भवति । अहं खलु श्रुणोमि गन्धं श्रवणाभ्याम् । अन्धकार पूरिताभ्यां नासापुटाभ्यां पश्यामि । रैम्यसगोत्रो ब्रह्म बन्धुरहं यस्य कस्य वा भागिनेयः खलु भीममेनस्य घटोत्कच इव

Dhūrtanartaka of Samaraja Dikshita is another comedy of intrigue. Cuddon defines the comedy of intrigue as "a form of comedy which depends on an intricate plot full of surprise and tends to subordinate character to plot. This distinguishes it from comedy of manners though the latter may also have complex plots. This form originated in Spain, was largely the work of a group of four famous dramatists" [36]

This prahasana of Samaraja Dikshita contains the nature of comedy of intrigue rather than of the farce. It is superior to other playlets like Laṭakamēlaka etc, with its nature of comedy of intrigue.

The humour evolved in this comedy of intrigue is somehow better than the comic found in a farce. Dhūrtanartaka with its humorous episodes and witty dialogues strikes the reader as both attractive and amusing.

In the prologue of this playlet, Samaraja Dikshita explains the way of his comic narration attributing some peculiar qualities to Murāri i.e. Lord Vishnu. See-

क्रीडन्नरी कदम्बी कलयति जगतामीश्वरे कंसशत्रौ
मिथ्या वैराग्यदम्भं निखिलवरवधूदत्ततालं तथोप्च्चैः ।
हास्यंञ्चक्रे कदाचिन्मदुभिदभिमतं पीतवस्त्रे चकर्षे
जातेत्वित्यं मुरारिः स्मितसुभगमुखः पातु युष्मान् स तस्मात् ॥

Mūḍheśwara is a teacher. Mukhara and Jagadvançaka are his pupils. Mūḍheśwara has fallen in love with Vasantalatā, a prostitute. After entering a garden enriched with the beauty of spring along with his two disciples, Mūḍheśwara grieves for his love. Forced by his pupils to give reason for his sorrow Mūḍheśwara reveals the fact after taking an oath from his boys to keep the matter secret. At this juncture Brahmānanda Swāmi, a companion of Mūḍheśwara enters the scene with his pupil Pāpa. Brahmānanda Swāmi has been in love with another whore, Padmā. Then they listen to a lyric, intended to introduce Vasantalatā. After listening it Mūḍheśwara becomes lovesick. He starts with his friend and students to see Vasantalatā, dancing before Śunṭhāçārya and his pupil, Nīlakanṭha. After completing the dance Vasantalatā gets back being followed by Mūḍheśwara. However, Mūḍheśwara prays to her by all means to come to his house that night. She accepts his request, and they take leave of each other.

In the second Sandhi of this Prahasana, Mūḍheśwara afflicted with lovesickness sends his pupil Jagadvançaka to bring Vasantalatā. He goes and begins to pray to her to love himself refusing his teacher, the old fox. Being unable to bear the delay Mūḍheśwara himself goes for Vasantalatā and finds his student

Jagadvançaka loving and embracing Vasantalatā. Then a quarrel breaks out between the teacher and the student. Jagadvançaka calls for soldiers. They arrest Mūḍheśwara and took him to their king Pāpāçāra along with Vasantalatā as soon as he sees her.

At the court of the King, Mūḍheśwara performs Sūrya namaskāra according to the tradition of 'Yavana'. Observing this Vidūṣaka enquires his particulars. Mūḍheśwara says that he is related to Nirmēdhāśraya and exhibits his scholarship in Jugglery. Then enter Nirmēdhāśraya, and Mañgalakuṭhāra Miśra. As Mañgalakuṭhāra Miśra praises Vasantalatā. The king is very much impressed of his talent and offers the lady to him. But knowing the view of Śunṭhāçārya, Mañgalakuṭhāra Miśra wants the king to give away Vasantalatā to Mūḍheśwara and he accepts her.

Samaraja Dikshita, has admirable command on vocabulary. He is an adept in using the right words in right place. In the interlude of Dhūrtanartaka, he says through *Sūtradhāra* as-

तत्वते निर्वृतिं यस्य वाचो लोकस्य कर्णयोः ।
रतिप्रमत्तवनिता कङ्कण क्वाण मञ्जुलाः ।

His style in prose as well as in poetry is रतिप्रमत्त वनिता कङ्कण क्वाण मञ्जुला as he states. Though such a style is common to any sentiment, some types of splitting, alterations are very much suitable to the sentiment, comic. We are aware of many comedians, uttering words, and splitting them in an unusual manner to rouse laughter in the spectators. In this Prahasana Samaraja employs such technique altering sounds to enliven humour. See some examples.

चिन्तयन्ति हि सदा मुदा हृदा-
कथमेषा योषा शेषावयवै स्तोषयति -
प्रिया ह्रियावनतमुखी तिष्ठति-

By its nature, it is a comedy of intrigue (Prahasana) but the character of Mukhara abundantly helps the author to narrate comic,

which mainly depends on context rather than on the word or sound. Mukhara dominates all the characters throughout the play.

At the very beginning of his appearance, Mūḍheśwara wants his two pupils to take oath taking the sea water. As they are on their way to the sea Mukhara suffers from fever and Mūḍheśwara gives a pill. He takes it and his throat burns. He asks for the remedy and his teacher wants him to drink sea water. He drinks and suffers more. This foolishness no doubt results in some laughter. But Mukhara is not really so foolish as he appears to be, and it is proved at the time of taking oath. He does not know how to take an oath. But he follows his fellow student and takes the oath like this.

शपामि गुरुदेवश्य चरणयोः यदि पुनरपि गुरुदेवश्य कथयामि ।

The absurdity in his statement is naturally funny. He follows the same at the time of disclosing the fact before Brahmānanda Swāmi a friend of Mūḍheśwara. "गुरुणापि समं हास्यं कर्तव्यं कुटिलं विना" is his motif. He exactly plays with Brahmānanda Swāmy and his student Pāpa applying the same principle which provokes Pāpa to beat Mukhara.

Vidūṣaka is an interesting character in this comedy of intrigue. False reasonings, perverted practices of customs and boastings etc, are the remarkable contents of his comic. See a false reasoning.

राजा :- वयस्य! यवनः जटिलोऽपि भवति?

विदूषकः :- भवत्येव

राजा :- कथमिव ?

विदूषक :- यथा तुरूष्को ब्राह्मणो भवति

Dikshita has employed a simple but powerful wit in this playlet. A repartee by Mukhara towards Brahmānanda Swāmy is remarkable. Brahmānanda Swāmy calls him as यत्स मर्कट इवा कलयते But at once Mukhara retorts अहं मर्कट इव त्वं पुनः मर्कट एव.

See another conversation.

विदूषक :-

पूर्वङ्गते हरगृहे तु मया च तेन
प्रक्षलितं गिरिसुता करनीरजैः ।
जङ्घायुगञ्च परिकल्पित मासनं में
तदिच्छिता करजस्पर्शेन सुखम् ॥

मूढ :- (विहस्य) (स्वगतम्) अहो दुरात्मनो वचनभङ्गी भीरुता। तदेनं प्रत्येवम् । (प्रकाशम्) कथं रे न वाञ्छस्यस्मान् । पश्य-

अस्माकं नियमोऽस्ति दैवत सरित्कल्लोल किम्मीरिते
स्थाने स्थेयमतो मुरारिभवनं याता वयं तत्र च।
तां हृष्ट्वा चरणे शिवस्य सदनं याता गलज्जाह्नवी
वीचीपुञ्जतरेण जातु सहसा तेनापि मूर्ध्ना धृताः ॥

However, this is a comedy of intrigue with polished and polite humour for our entertainment.

Comedy of ideas is another type of comedy. It is defined as "a term loosely applied to plays which tend to debate in witty and humorous fashions, ideas and theories". [37] Comedy of morals is also a type of comedy, but it is very closer to the comedy of ideas. It is "a satirical comedy designed to ridicule and correct vices like hypocrisy, pride, avarice, social simulations and nepotism" [38]

We have some modern plays that can be grouped as the comedy of ideas and the comedy of morals. Rāmanāma dātavya ṣikitsālaya, Sāmya Sāgara Kallōla Prahasana etc, come under this category. Let us examine some.

Hindu Philosophy exhorts men to do their duty selflessly and not to think about the result. This *Niṣkāma yōga* lays greater responsibility on human beings, since one cannot get anything without hard and wise work. However, there are people who are lazy. They don't work and say foolishly that what will be will be. They leave all things to God not out of Jnāna but out of shear indolence. Rāmanāma dātavya ṣikitsālaya represents this school of thought.

A doctor starts a hospital by name 'Rāmanāmadātavya Ḉikitsālaya. He prescribes only one medicine that is 'Rāmanāma' for all diseases like Asthma, Tuberculosis stomach-ache, forgetfulness, Venereal diseases and even to silence one's shrewish wife. The doctor prescribes Rāmanāma as panacea. He requests every patient to grow up a Tulasi garden, build up a hermitage in the middle of the garden, paint all the walls with Rāmanāma, and stay in round the clock.

The human body made of the five elements has its own frailties. Whether he is a physician or a philosopher he should try to save one's life until the last breath. One has to say Nārāyaṇa in the ears of the patient, only when the human effort becomes helpless to save him. Disinclination to do one's best is unpardonable. This Prahasana has the psychological base, of this type of positive thinking.

Now-a-days the word 'socialism' has become a magic wand to ensure common people for the sake of one's own political gains. With the charm of the 'Khaadi' dress, the politician chants the word 'Socialism' to enchant people. In fact, Socialism is a sanctified process of sacrificing hearts. However, the slogan has become a golden duck for selfish people these days. Misleading their followers, misguiding their successors and misinterpreting the theories many political hypocrites have demeaned the concept of Socialism. Jīvanyāya Tīrtha has attempted a sincere and sharp criticism of these people in his Sāmya Sāgara Kallōla Prahasana.

Gaṇanātha is a socialist to the extreme. He has many followers. His only objective in life is to bring radical changes in the country and culture and build up a 'Rāma Rājya' on the basis of Socialism.

Once Gaṇanātha meets an ascetic, a follower of custom and tradition. He suggests that Gaṇanātha should not hatch disputes to divide and rule over the country. He points out some of the practical defects in socialism. He frankly questions why many socialists had more property than they should as true socialists.

On the advice of Gaṇanātha, many factory workers go on strike. The owner of the factory announces 'lockout'. They face many difficulties, but Gaṇanātha wants them to agitate and revolt. He instigates them to violence. Meanwhile, differences creep up between cultivators and labourers. A labourer dies of hunger. The agitators plunder all the ration shops resulting in the death of a boy. In the end, all the labourers and cultivators realise the 'divide and rule' policy of Gaṇanātha, to attain his selfish ends and chase him to kill. Fortunately, the ascetic interferes in time and saves Gaṇanātha for the sake of peace.

This comedy of ideas mainly deals with the false ideas and irregular practices of politicians and satirises them. Morality reigns supreme over humour in this comedy. Hence it is nearer to block comedy. It is ridiculous on the part of Gaṇanātha to allege that the ascetic has betrayed the nation without showing proper proof, just to attack the poor man. The world has many such Gaṇanāthas and they deserve sure punishment

In literature, Symbolism plays an important role to exhibit the views of poets. "Symbolism is a device of the poetic art when it refers to something in the poem standing for something else in the poem; it is a power of poetic language when it refers to the way of words and rhythms can awake mystery; it is a function of the whole poem when it refers to the kinds of meaning a literary work can stand for ... it is obviously best when using the term to specify the exact sense intended" [39]

Vimukti Prahasana of Dr. V. Raghavan is a symbolic comedy. He took many philosophical terms commanding the entire universe and applied them indirectly in the regular course of life of a middle-class family. He has developed the theme with super skill offering the best entertainment possible to the audience. At the end of this playlet the poet himself clarifies the relationship among his characters which has been kept symbolic up to the end.

ईशस्त्वं पुरुषोऽस्मि गेहमिह मे देहं स दंष्ट्री यमः
सा भार्या प्रकृतिः गुणा भगिनिका माया च तासां प्रसूः ।
षट्पुत्रा मन इन्द्रियाणि नगरं लोकः विमुक्त्यै ततः
सत्त्वस्था प्रकृतिस्तथा प्रहसनं दृष्ट्वा जना जानतम् ॥

Ātmanātha (जीवात्मा) is the main character of this play with his wife Trivarṇini (प्रकृतिः:), six sons and three sister-in-laws. Unable to control his shrewish wife and his wicked sons, Ātmanātha suffers a lot in silence. After the commencement of the play, Ćandrikā, Sōnitā and Hastini also enter the stage. Sōnitā' and Hastini support their sister, but Ćandrikā keeps silent. As a result, Trivarṇini develops hatred towards Ćandrikā. Ātmanātha falls in love with Ćandrikā at first sight but he has no time even to talk to her. After the play has run halfway Ātmanātha vexed with the behaviour of his sons and wife, quits his house and takes rest on the bank of a nearby river. He meets Ćandrikā there, but unfortunately at the very minute, Trivarṇini also comes there. Frightened Ćandrikā hider somewhere. At last, Ātmanātha with the help of an old man (Isvara) recites an incantation which results in the death of Maayaavathi (Maya) mother of Trivarṇini who has been misguiding Trivarṇini all the time. After her mother's death Trivarṇini regrets her past mistakes and falls at her husband's feet. Ātmanātha marries Ćandrikā also and the play ends in cheers.

The characterisation of Trivarṇini deserves praise. We see many shrews like Trivarṇini in our daily lives. Her parody exaggerating the glory of wives, especially of herself is very simple but comical.

यच्च किञ्चित् जगत्सर्वं दृश्यते श्रूयतेऽपि वा ।
अन्तर्बहिश्च तत्सर्वं व्याप्य भार्या विचेष्टते ॥[40]

It is very difficult to point out any one or two comic-oriented sentences in this Prahasana as most of the comic depends upon the skill of conversation and the development of the context and its consequences.

Thus, vimukti prahasana deals with many contemporary social follies and brings them into light. The author has dealt with the unusual and unwanted affection of parents towards their children, thus doing them more harm than good, the escaping nature of the youth keeping themselves away from family problems, etc.

The fantasy lies on the statement of the author like

प्रपञ्चोऽयं किमपि करालमथवा अतिकरुण प्रहसनम्

taking support of the following verse of Bhallaṭa-

एतत्तस्य मुखात् कियत्कमलिनी पत्रे कर्ण पाथसो
यन्मुक्तामणिरित्यमंस्त स जडः शृण्वेत दस्मादपि ।
अङ्गल्यग्र नख क्रिया प्रविलयत्यादीयमाने शनैः
कुत्रोड्डीय गतो हहेत्यनुदिनं निद्राति नान्तश्शुचा ॥

is very fantastic. He himself lists out certain particular qualities which are the primary needs to any reader of Prahasanas like Vimukti Prahasana. Read-

प्रेक्षा विशेष निबन्धन मिदम् । ईदृशस्य महा प्रहसनत्य सन्दर्भणाय वः गभीरप्रकृतिः स्तिमितौदारः ऋपिकल्पः कविः सूक्ष्मं निर्लेपं हृदयमेव च कल्पेते

Harijīvana Miśra deserves praise for his peerless composition of Vibudha Mōhana Prahasana taking verses from many Sanskrit works. Vibudha Mōhana is a fantastic and surprising symbolic comedy which has aimed mainly at the highness of the aesthetic experience as the result of the study of literature. The comic nourished in this is very delicate and impressive.

In Vibudha Mōhana, Akhandānanda is the hero and Sāhityamālā. is the heroine Sāhityamālā is fond of Arthālankāra Sakalāgamāçārya is her father. Sāhityamālā's brother visits the court of pratāpamārtānḍa, where he meets several scholars in various subjects like-

तर्क कर्कश, ज्ञानेन्द्र, भट्टमीमांसक, सांख्यानन्द, पातञ्जल नाथ, वैशेषिक भट्टाचार्य, पाशुपत, पाञ्चरात्रिक and अखण्डानन्द

All of them commence a discussion seeking ways to attain a seat in the heaven. They differ from one another as every Śāstra has its own theory and philosophy. Then Akhandānanda concludes that aesthetic experience is the best of all, and better than even 'Brahmānanda' of philosophers which requires श्रवण, मनन, and निदिध्यासन more than the aesthetic experience. Saying so, to please the king, he refers to a stanza thus -

वक्त्राणि पञ्च कुचयोः प्रतिविम्बितानि
दृष्ट्वा दशानन समागमन भ्रमेण ।
भूयोऽपि शैल परिवृत्ति भयेन गाढ
मालिङ्गितो गिरिजया गिरिशोऽवताद्वः ॥

The king Pratāpamārtāṇḍa favours Akhandānanda and honours him. He wants Sāhityamālā. King Pratāpamārtāṇḍa pays money to the brother of Sāhityamālā and gets her married to Akhandānanda. All the characters are symbolic and evoke comic.

Some epigrams in this playlet are very attractive.

मूर्खेऽपि जल्पतां पुसां श्रुत्वा वाचश्शुभाशुभाः ।
अशुभं वाक्यमादत्ते पुरीषमिव सूकरः ॥

Harijīvana Miśra has quoted a beautiful verse of Amaruka in this Prahasana attributing the title, 'The king of sentiments' to Sṛngāra. See

मुग्धे मुग्धतयैव नेतु मखिलः कालः किमारभ्यते
मानं धत्स्व धृतिं बधान ऋजुतां दूरे कुरु प्रेयसि ।
सख्यैवं प्रतिबोधिता प्रतिवचस्ता माह भीतानना
नीचैश्शांस हृदिस्थितो हि ननु मे प्राणेश्वरः श्रोष्यति ॥

Sahṛdayānanda of Harijīvana Miśra is also a symbolic comedy in which Abhidhā, Lakṣanā and Vyanjanā are made heroines after the names of Svīyā, Sāmānyā and Parakīyā. He deals with the merits and demerits of poetry. In fact, the fiction is basically delighting and amusing and therefore this symbolic comedy is ravishing.

Unfortunately, some indelicate scenes are also allowed in this Prahasana.

A mention may be made of 'Ṭaṇḍatāṇḍava' of Jīvanyāyathīrtha in this context. Though the author himself has considered it a farce, to me it seems a symbolic comedy.

FOOT NOTES

1. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics P 271
2. A Dictionary of Literary Terms P 259
3. चित्रं चरित्रं स्खलितव्रतानां शीलाकरः शङ्खधरस्तनोति ।
   विद्वज्जनानां विनयानुवर्ती धात्री पवित्रीकरणः कवीन्द्रः ॥ 1-7
4. शुद्धं कीर्णं वैकृतञ्च तच्च प्रहसनं त्रिथा ।
   शुद्धं श्रोत्रिय शोभादेर्वेषभाषादि संयुतम् ॥
   चेट चेटी जनव्याप्तं तस्य लक्ष्यं निरूप्यताम् ।
   आनन्दकोशप्रमुखं तथा भगवदज्जुकम् ॥ Nāṭakaparibhāṣā
5. वैद्योऽहं व्याधिवर्गाणामाश्रयोऽप्ययशो निधिः ।
   मया चिकित्सित स्सद्यो मार्कण्डेयो न जीवति ॥
   सर्वौषधानि तिष्ठन्तु चिकित्सापि च तिष्ठतु ।
   मम दर्शनतो रोगी किल प्राणैर्विमुच्यते ॥ Hāsyārṇava Prahasana 1-31, 32
6. वेदी सज्जघनञ्च तत्परिसरे कुण्डं वराङ्गं फलं
   नैवेद्याय कुचद्वयं मृगदृशः कामानलः प्रोज्ज्वलः ।
   होताहं खलु शुक्रहव्यनिवहः शेफः स्रुवो वर्तते
   नित्यं पञ्चशराध्वरं त्यजति कः सद्यस्सुखं यत्फलम् ॥ Ibid 2-16
7. निष्क्रामति शिशोः कायः येन रन्ध्रेण योषितः ।
   किं करिष्यति तत्रायं वटुः शिश्नशलाकया ॥ Ibid 2-20
8. Every man in his humour (Ben Jonson) Prologue
9. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics P 147
10. An outline history of English literature P 36
11. History of English Literature -P 146
12. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics P 147
13. A highly defective system of education is alienating the individual from his fellow-human beings … Preface P VI
14. Kōṭi Vidyalu Kūṭi Korake -Telugu Saametalu P 147
15. A Dictionary of Literary Terms P 137
16. Comedy P 54, 55
17. A Dictionary of Literary Terms P 196
18. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics -P 738
19. Satire - P 3

20. Ibid -P 3
21. The New Dictionary of Thoughts -P 566
22. Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka -P 12
23. Adhunika Samskrta Naatak P 335
24. P.V. Ramanujaswamy - Introduction to Ḍamaruka -P 6
25. तुभ्यं न तिष्ठे हाहेतिवदन्तीं कविताङ्गामं
पतिव्रतामिव विटो वक्ति दुस्तुन्द पूर्तये ॥ Ḍamaruka V 53
26. नामान्तर निदेशेन इलोकमेकं कविब्रुवः ।
नाना प्रभुसभारङ्गे वक्ति दुस्तुन्द पूर्तये ॥ Ḍamaruka
27. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics -P 601
28. Ibid -P 601
29. Pratāparudra Vijaya - Preface P XVI
30. अनश्लीललसद्वाणि निसर्गरसबन्धनम् ।
नवं लघु च यत्किञ्चद्विनोदाय निरूप्यताम् ॥ V-3
31. बृहस्पतिः प्रशस्ति वाचनाय संरभते; हिक्कति; शोधयति कण्ठं;
भ्रान्ताक्षि स्तब्धीभवति, न तु वक्तु शक्नोति Prataaparudravijaya-P 29
32. यदा किञ्चदज्ञोहं गजइव मदान्धस्समभवं
तदा सर्वज्ञोऽस्मीत्यभवदवलिप्तं मम मनः ।
यदा किञ्चत्किञ्चि द्बुधजन सकाशादधिगतं
तदा मूखोंऽस्मीति ज्वर इव मदो मे व्यपगतः ॥ Bhartṛhari Nītiśataka V 7
33. नाहं जानामि केयूरे नाहं जानामि कुण्डले ।
नूपुरेत्वभि जानामि नित्यं पादाभिवन्दनात् ॥ Rāmāyaṇam Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa 7-22
34. Dāmaka Prahasana - Preface
35. संस्कृत में एकांकी रूपक
36. A Dictionary of Literary Terms -P 137
37. Ibid -P 137
38. Ibid -P 137
39. Encyclopaedia of Poetry and Poetics P 835
40. यच्च किञ्चित् जगत्सर्वं दृश्यते श्रूयतेऽपि वा ।
अन्तर्बहिश्च तत्सर्वं व्याप्य नारायणः स्थितः ॥ Nārāyana Sūktam

CONCLUSION

It is already notified that according to Bharata - Sṛngāra, Raudra, Vīra and Bībhatsa are the main sentiments from which Hāsya, Karuṇa, Adbhuta, and Bhayānaka are derived respectively. But Abhinavagupta says that Śānta is the main sentiment and the remaining eight are the transformations of Śānta, which is connected with Mōkṣa one of the four human goals (Puruṣārthas). Then Hāsya has its place as one of the four secondary sentiments. But it dominates almost all the sentiments like Sṛngāra, Vīra, Sānta etc. Most of the Sanskrit dramatists are benefited by the Hāsya, though the dramas mainly contain either Sṛngāra or Vīra, or any other sentiment like Śānta in dramas like Prabōdhaçandrōdaya etc. Thus, Hāsya and the Prahasanas helped the playwrights to direct the society towards the four human goals. Let us study the point in detail-

Indians are strictly instructed to concentrate on the four human goals namely Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mōkṣa in everything they practise. It is inevitable because these four are the main principles for the peaceful routine course of life of all human beings. The first three are worldly (Aihika) whereas the fourth is spiritual (Āmuṣmika). Dharma, Artha and Kāma are the instruments to attain Mōkṣa.

तदेतत् त्रितयं प्रोक्तं त्रिवर्ग इति पण्डितैः ।
मोक्षस्तु साध्य एवेति पुरुषार्थ चतुष्टयम् ॥

Even in the Trivarga i.e., Dharma, Artha and Kāma; Dharma has individuality. Artha and Kāma should always be supported by Dharma. Thus, Dharma plays a major role in regulating Artha and Kāma and guides the human beings in the path of Mōkṣa (Solvation).

All creatures have to eat to live. So is the case with human beings too. So, struggle for earning and existence is inevitable, which indicates the importance of Artha and represents the sentiment vīra. After earning something, man wants to enjoy life which results in selfishness (Mamatā) and dominates man's life. This selfishness is the basic element of Kāma. Kāma is inseparable from human life as it is listed both in the human goals (Puruṣārthas, and in the group of six foes

(Ariṣaḍvarga). Indian philosophy has realized the significance of Kāma the existence of the individual as well as the social lives. But like a river flowing with mud and dirt Kāma also flows with passions and undesirable emotions. Then Dharma has to regulate Kāma and keep it in right track. As such Kāma regulated by Dharma becomes the third Puruṣārtha and not the first of Ariṣaḍvarga. Thus, the association of Dharma, with Artha and Kāma has given a wide scope for so many principles, maxims, philosophies and religions to conduct and guide the humanity in the right path. See a statement from Ahirbudnya Samhitā-

अथो धर्मस्य कामस्य तथार्थस्यापि साधनम् ।
धर्मो धर्मस्य कामस्य तथार्थस्यापि साधनम् ॥

कामो धर्मस्य कामस्य तथार्थस्यापि साधनम् ।
अर्थः कामस्य सर्वत्र व्यभिचारेणैव साधनम् ।
धर्मः सर्वत्र साध्यस्य नियमेनैव साधनम् ॥

In course of mankind's history certain times come when people resort to evil ways, throw away the moral values to the winds, mock at ideals and in short, the society swerves from the path of Dharma and goes astray. During such critical periods, the writers have a responsibility towards society in which they are living. Endowed with social awareness they should use their pens to set right the evil practices of the society and keep it going on right track. The ancient authors of Sanskrit plays and Prahasanas have done service to the society in this regard.

Eccentric persons with little regard for moral values, and those are hated by the society are, generally taken as characters in Prahasanas of ancient times. However, there is some change in the characters developed in modern Prahasanas. Sanskrit literature except Prahasana, Bhāṇa etc., tries to represent and deal with the noble and gentle characters in a positive approach. But Prahasana literature does it with negative approach. So, the Prahasanas are intended to show the things that are perverted and polluted and to suggest how they should reform themselves and work in a right way.

However, there are certain Prahasanas like Bhagavadajjuka of ancient times and certain other Prahasanas of modern times which have positive approach. More-over ancient Prahasanas have dealt with the Dharma Kāma (धर्माविरुद्धकाम) mainly whereas the modern Prahasanas with Dharmārtha (धर्माविरुद्दार्थ)

Mattavilāsa Prahasana, Bhagavadajjuka, Laṭakamēlaka, Hāsyaçuḍāmaṇi etc., are the available Prahasanas of ancient times written before 13th century. Though all these are intended to elevate Dharmakāma, there is slight difference in them in showing their individuality. Mattavilāsa Prahasana being intended for Dharmakāma, devotes to the magnanimity in practising one's cultural philosophy rather than other values. What Gita says - स्वधर्मे निधनं श्रेयः परधर्मो भयावहः is perfectly applicable to Mattavilāsa Prahasana.

Ironically exalting and mocking at the Buddhistic philosophy and pointing out the actual stature of Pāśupata religion are the main features of Mattavilāsa Prahasana. It is a well-known fact that Buddhistic philosophy, having taken many religions into its fold from the Vedic Philosophy, spread rapidly over the world for some centuries. But unfortunately, the successors of Buddha had to admit defeat as the followers of Buddhism grew selfish, left morality and violated the Buddhistic principles. All such downfalls and follies are magnificently represented in Mattavilāsa Prahasana which can be called a comedy of manners. Laṭakamēlaka is also intended purge and cleanse evil practised Dharmakāma. The name Laṭakamēlaka i.e., the association of paramours itself indicates the characteristics of the play. It focusses the evil effects of treacherous customs in the society and how they ruin the victims and thus opens the eyes of spectators. Thus, Laṭakamēlaka directly picturises the down fallen Dharmakāma and simultaneously suggests the importance of the practice of Kāma as a human goal. Bhagavadajjuka directly touches धर्मकाम and धर्मार्थ both in positive and negative manners and exalts itself by establishing both Kāma and Artha in brief. Hāsyaçuḍāmaṇi deals with both Artha and Kāma in a better way than the above three. Applaudable for its way of presentation, vulgarity and indecency have no place in this. The

comic, here, is simple, lucid and cheerful. Such works are very rare in ancient Prahasanas. The author criticises the fundamental weakness of human psychology. This is the phenomenon of the four human goals as picturised in the four ancient Prahasanas available so far. No one has tried to divert, or pervert or destroy Dharma, Artha and Kāma. They have never encouraged corruption. They endeavoured to understand the society and its changes from time to time based on social and environmental conditions. They did their best to expose evil by satirising and purge the society of its ills. Even some of the modern playwrights like Jagadīśa Bhattaçarya in Hāsyārṇava Prahasana, Samarāja Dīkṣita in his Dhūrtanartaka Prahasana, Rāmapāṇivada in his Madanakētuçarita etc., have contributed a lot of to the literature to establish value-based Kaama which is not against Dharma.

But their poetic zeal led them to extremity and it resulted in vulgarity, indecency and exaggeration in dealing with the plot and character.

There are certain Prahasanas like Kālidāsa Prahasana alias Lambodara Prahasana. Unmattakavikalaśa Prahasana, Anidrarativīra Prahasana etc., which are enriched with the sentiment Bībhatsa than Hāsya. Farces, especially vulgar ones are to be enumerated under this category. But there are some Prahasanas called domestic comedies like Līlāvilāsa Prahasana, Ubhayarūpaka, Dharitrīpatinirvaçana, Snuṣavijaya, Nanāvitādana etc., filled with polite and polished Hasya bringing out the defects and their consequences in household life. These are entirely different from the above said Prahasanas, though both the categories deal with the same element Kāma which is not against Dharma.

Daridradurdaiva Prahasana, Puruṣaramaṇīya Prahasana etc, ironically point out the difficulties in getting the livelihood and earning the daily food. The character Kṣudrārāma in Daridradurdaiva Prahasana is a specimen for misers and shows how greedy people are to have everything without sacrificing a penny. A pitiable character in Çipiṭakaçarvaṇa proves the miserliness of some people who will not spend even for themselves. But Kauṇḍinya, a character in Kauṇḍinya Prahasana explains the eagerness of some people who in the guise

of gentlemen, lean on others at the cost of their prestige, dignity etc. Besides such lazy men there are some other who work hard, prefer dignity of labour and uphold the nobility of duty. Indrajala Prahasana proves this. Though there is nothing but jugglery, the scholarship of the author has made it a masterpiece. At the end of that Prahasana, we appreciate the juggler sympathetically and more so his assistant, a little boy.

Artha, it means not only money but also Artha Sāstra i. e, theory of politics. Our ancient philosophers like Kauṭilya had contributed a lot to the doctrine of political science. Though Prahasanas of olden days which dealt with politics are very rare. Many Prahasanas of modern period are making point of dealing political issues. Unfortunately, in our democratic country, many unsolved problems draw the attention of many writers. Sanskrit scholars are also not far from those problems. Svargīya Hasana Prahasana, Vēṣṭana Vyāyōga, Atha Kim etc., deal with political issues. Sāmya Sāgara Kallōla Prahasana directly criticises the defects of Socialism. It takes pains to normalise the physically handicapped people and the Government in implementing the theory of socialism.

As a matter of fact, Dharma and Auçitya are very close to each other. The accurate principle of Auçitya is Dharma. Auçitya is all pervading and the essence of it, is Dharma. We know almost all the types of Prahasanas where a display of indecency and bad manners, developed. Their views are to purge the ill-decorum and follies of the society and to establish a model universe on the foundation of morality. So, all the Prahasanas more or less are the measurements of the Dharma of the contemporary society. The basic elements in any Dharma and at any time are not changeable. So, we have to take the ancient principles of Dharma and modernise them as per the contemporary Indian Society. In a word. our written constitution of democracy and our law and order are the texts of Dharma which the society needs at present. Every deed against law is an offence. So Prahasanas, containing the characters with offence are also the texts dealing with Dharma, the first human goal.

Lack of devotion to one's duty, corruption, selfishness etc., are the main diseases of the contemporary Indian society destroying Indian culture and civilization. To expose these lapses and set them right, many Prahasana writers have taken pains. Indrajālam etc., come under this category.

Thus, the Prahasanas in Sanskrit are, perfectly associated with Dharma, Artha and Kāma; and Mōkṣa, the four human goals and they form the pillars of Indian culture as well as the Indian nationality.

Though Abhinavagupta restricted that children, ladies and stupids are the spectators of Prahasana and only low type characters should only be imitated in Prahasanas, his limitations are neither substantial nor sound. It is already said that verbal humour requires intellectuals, not stupids to enjoy the fun of it, On the other hand Prahasanas call for talented wit as they criticise different departments, religions, institutions of life to sanctify them. It is the only instrument that can effectively satirise and moralise the society without facing any untoward reactions.

Though many critics say that Sanskrit is dead, we feel that it is unfair to say so by examining the entire Prahasana literature which has kept changing along with the time and social conditions. There are some others who blame that Sanskrit Literature lacks in Haasya, and that Sanskrit scholars and poets have never devoted themselves to develop Hāsya. But it is proved baseless as many varieties of Hāsya in good form and life are exposed in Prahasanas. It is high time to try to develop and propagate Sanskrit literature, especially the dramatic literature with all its varieties, which have a healthy social outlook and social awareness. Even to find out the facts about Hāsya in Sanskrit other than the Prahasana literature, it is necessary and proper to make an extensive study of Sanskrit literature with a sympathetic view, and with an effort to understand the authors kindly.

Appendix - I

Bibliography of prahasana

S.No.	Name of Prahasana	Author's Name	Published/ Unpublished/ Unavailable	Reference
1.	Antyēṣṭi Samskāra Prahasanam	Original: Tagore Trans: K. Kamala	Published	“Suryodaya” (Journal)
2.	Akinçana Kāṇçanam	Rajendra Misra	”	Vyjayanta Prakasanam 1974 – Jaipur
3.	Atha Kim	Siddheswara Chattopadhyaya	”	Sanskṛta Sahitya Parishat, Calcutta 1974
4.	Adbhuta Taranga Prahasanam	Harijivana Misra	Unpublished	Anup Library, Bikaner
5.	Anangadā Prahasanam	Vakulabhushana	Published	Bhaarati (Patrikaa) 6-1
6.	Anyāya Rāja Prahasanam	B. Ramanujacharya	”	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
7.	Anidrarati Vira Prahasanam	Vikrala Seshacharyulu	Unpublished	Available with the Author
8.	Anukūlagala Hastaka Prahasanam	Viṣṇu Pada Bhattacharya	Published	Manjusaa (Patrika) 1959
9.	Amarṣa Mahimā Prahasanam	Trivenkatacharya	”	Introduction to Dhūrta Nartaka

10.	Araghaṭṭa Ghaṭa Prahasanam	Skanda Sankar	”	Nagapore
11.	Alabdha Karmīya Prahasanam	K. R. Nair	Published	Sreechitra - Trivandrum 1942
12.	Ātma Stuti Prahasanam	Unknown	Unpublished	Arvachina Samskrta Sahitya-Sri Varnekar P. 121
13.	Ānandakośa Prahasanam	-	Unavailable	Referred in Rasārṇavasudhākara
14.	Indrajālam	Rajendra Misra	Unpublished	
15.	Unmattakavikalaśa Prahasanam	Venkateswara	”	Saraswatimahal Library, Tanjore
16.	Ubhaya Rūpakam	Mahālinga Sastry	Published	Udyana Patrika, 1962
17.	Kah Prathamam Jalamānēṣyati	Dr. Alokadas Gupta	”	
18.	Kah Śrēyān	Gajēndra Śankarlal	”	Bombay 1976
19.	Kandarpakēli Prahasanam	-	Unavailable	Sahityadarpana
20.	Kapotālaya Prahasanam	Leela	Published	Ādhunika Samskṛt Nāṭaka Vol II P. 1024
21.	Karma Phala Prahasanam	Rāmanātha		Ādhunika Samskṛt Naṭaka Vol. II P 947

22.	Kali Kēli Prahasanam or Śaśi Kalā Prahasanam	-	Unavailable	Bhāvaprakāśana of Sarada Tanaya
23.	Kālimāhātmya Prahasanam	-	Published	“Vidyodaya” (Patrikaa), Lahore
24.	Kaliviḍamba Prahasanam	-		Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
25.	Kavi Sammēlana Prahasanam	Viśwanatha Miśra	Published	Bhaarati 21-1
26.	Kāñcanamālā Prahasanam	Surendramohana		
27.	Kalāvilāsa Prahasanam	Ramanuja Vidyābhūṣaṇa	Published	Vidyodaya (Patirkaa), Lahore
28.	Kalāvilāsa Prahasanam	Bharadwaja		Baroda Oriental Research Inst.
29.	Kālidāsa Prahasanam	Vengatesa	Published	Vavilla Ramaswamy Sastrulu & Sons, Madras 1916
30.	Kālikēli Prahasanam			“A Bibliography of Sanskrit Drama”.
31.	Kāśi Dāsa Prahasanam			Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka

32.	Kukṣimbhari Prahasanam or Kukṣimbhara Bhaikṣava Prahasanam	Venkatacharya	Unpublished	Oriental Manuscript Library, Mysore
33.	Kuhanā Bhaikṣava Prahasanam	Tirumalanatha	”	Oriental Manuscript Library, Mysore
34.	Kumāra Vijaya Prahasanam	Ghanaśyāma	”	Ādhunik Samskṛt Nāṭak, Vol 1 - 329
35.	Kṛṣṇadautya Prahasanam	-	”	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
36.	Kaunḍinya Prahasanam	Mahalinga Sastry	Published	Sahitya Chandrasala - Tiruvalangudu.
37.	Kautuka Sarvaswa Prahasanam	Gopīnātha Chakravarti	Unpublished	
38.	Kautuka Ratnākara Prahasanam	Kavitārkika	”	Indian Library, London
39.	Kṣutkṣēmīya Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyathīrtha	Published	Calcutta 1972
40.	Guruvākyam	Original: Tagore Trans: Rudradeva Tripaṭhi	”	
41.	Gauri Digambara Prahasanam	Sankara Misra	”	Haridas Sanskrit Series 283 (Chawkhamba Sanskrit Series Office) 1979.

42.	Ghṛtakulyāvali Prahasanam	Harijivana Misra	Unpublished	Anup Library, Bikaner
43.	Ṣaṇḍatāṇḍava Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	Published	Panchananasmṛti Grandhamaalaa - Culcutta
44.	Ṣaṇḍānuranjanam	Ghanaśyāma	Unpublished	Saraswati Mahal Library - Tanjore
45.	Ṣāmuṇḍā	K.L.V. Sastry	Published	Palghat
46.	Ṣipiṭakaṣarvaṇa Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrta	”	Calcutta 1972
47.	Ṣaura Ṣāturīya Prahasanam	”	”	Samskṛta Sahitya Pariṣhat Patrikaa - 1951
48.	Ṣhalitādhamarṇam	Rajendra Misra	”	Akshaya Vata Prakasanam - Allahabad 1977
49.	Ḍamarukam	Ghanaṣyama	”	Vavilla Ramaswamy Sastrulu & Sons -Madras 1939
50.	Ḍiṇḍima Prahasanam			
51.	Ḍōlāpanṣālaka Prahasanam	Ramanatha Sastry		Samskṛt Mē Ēkānki Rūpak P. 24
52.	Tīrthayātrā Prahasanam	Ramkuber Malavya	”	“Suryodaya” - 1966
53.	Tylavimardana Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Calcutta 1964

54.	Damanaka Prahasanam	-	”	Oriental Manuscript Library Mysore
55.	Daridradurdaiva Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Samskṛt Sahitya Parishat Calcutta 1968
56.	Dāmaka Prahasanam	-	”	The Punjab Sanskrit Book Depot - Lahore 1926
57.	Dēvadurgati Prahasanam	-	”	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक P25
58.	Daurbhāgyamanjari Prahasanam	Ramapanivada	Unpublished	Govt. Library, Tiruvanantapur
59.	Dhayēyam Gāyani Kalā	Gajanana Bala Krishna Palasule	Published	आधुनिक संस्कृत नाटक Vol. II P. 1224
60.	Dharitrī Pati Nirvaçana Prahasanam	Sidheswara Chattopadhyaya	”	Samskṛta Sahitya Parishat. Calcutta 1971
61.	Dhūrtaçarita Prahasanam	-	”	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक P. 25
62.	Dhūrta Nartaka Prahasanam	Samaraja Dikshita	”	Sri Lalbahadur Sastry Kendriya Samskrta Vidya Pitham, New Delhi 1978
63.	Dhūrta Viḍambana Prahasanam	Amarēśwara	Unpublished	New Catalogues Catalogorum Vol. IX P. 303
64.	Dhūrta Viḍambana Prahasanam	Maheśwara	”	New Catalogues Catalogorum Vol. IX P 303

65.	Dhūrta Samāgama Prahasanam	Jyotiriswara	”	Oriental Manuscript Library Madras R. 2380
66.	Dhṛvatāram	Skanda Sankar	Published	Nagapore
67.	Naṭakamēlaka Prahasanam	-	”	संस्कृत में एकाई रूपक P.25
68.	Nanā vitāḍanam	Siddheswara Chattopadhyaya	”	Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Calcutta 1974
69.	Napumsaka Lingasya Mōkṣa Prāptih	Satyavrata Sastry	”	“Bhaarati” (Patrika) 4-5
70.	Navarasa Prahasanam	Rajendra Misra	”	Vyjayanta Prakasanam Doronupurar - Jainpur, 1/72
71.	Navoḍā Vadhūh Varasça	Pattabhirama Sastry	”	Samskrta Sahitya Parishat Patrikaa – Calcutta, 1963
72.	Naṣṭahāsya Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Calcutta 1964
73.	Nāṭavāta Prahasanam	Yadunandana	”	Bombay
74.	Nātye Ça Dakṣā Vayam	Ksheerasagara	”	“Suryodaya” 4-3, 4-5
75.	Nipuṇikā	K. L V. Sastry	”	Palghot
76.	Nirgṛhaghaṭṭam	Rajendramisra	Unpublished	Available with the Author
77.	Paṇḍitācaṛita Prahasanam	Madhusudana Kavyateertha	”	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक p. 24
78.	Payōdhimanthana Prahasanam			संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक p. 24

79.	Palāṇḍumaṇḍana Prahasanam	Harijivanamisra	”	Anup Library - Bikaner
80.	Pāṇḍityatāṇḍavita Prahasanam	Vatukananatha Sarma	Published	“Suryodaya” 1972
81.	Puruṣaramaṇīya Prahasanam	Jivanyayatirtha	”	Sanskrta Sahitya Parishat Patrika Calcutta 1948
82.	Pāṣaṇḍaviḍambana Prahasanam	Maheswara	”	
83.	Pratāparudra Vijaya Or Vidyānatha Viḍambanam	Dr. V. Raghavan	”	“Punarvasu” Madras 1969
84.	Prātaparudrīya Viḍambana Prahasanam	Madhusudana Kavyateertha	-	-
85.	Pratyāśi Parīkṣaṇam	Haridatta Sastry	”	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
86.	Prahasanam	Sivarama Sarma	”	”
87.	Prāsañgika Prahasanam	Harijivanamisra	Unpublished	Anup Library, Bikaner
88.	Buddhi Prahasanam	Gajendra Sankar Lal Pandya	Published	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
89.	Bṛhatsābhadraka Prahasanam	-	Unavailable	

90.	Bhagavadajjukam	Bodhayana	Published	Devabhasha Prakasanam Prayaga – 1979
91.	Bhatta Sañkaṭa Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat Patrikaa Calcutta – 1926
92.	Bhālabhaviṣya Prahasanam	-	”	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
93.	Bhramarakāhalī Prahasanam	-	”	”
94.	Mañikāñcana Samanvayah	Visnupada Bhattacharya	”	Manjuṣaa 14-4
95.	Maṇimanjuṣā	Surendramohan	”	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक p. 24
96.	Mattavilāsa Prahasanam	Mahendra Vikrama Varma	”	Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan Varanasi 1966
97.	Madanakētuçaritam	Ramapanivada	”	
98.	Mattavilāsa Prahasanam	Pedakomati Vemareddy	Unavailable	Contribution of Andhras to Sanskrit Literature p. 66
99.	Mālābhaviṣya Prahasanam	Skanda Sankar Koth	Published	Nagapore
100.	Mithyāçāra Prahasanam			A Bibliography of Sanskrit Drama p. 104
101.	Mithyāgrahaṇa Prahasanam	Līla	Published	Probably in Manjusa between 1955 and 1961

102.	Muṇḍita Prahasanam	Ṡivajyōtirvinda	Unavailable	”
103.	Rāgavirāga Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	Published	Calcutta 1972
104.	Rāmanāma Dātavya Ċikitsālaya Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Calcutta
105.	Laṭakamēlaka Prahasanam	Sankhadhara	”	Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan Varanasi 1962
106.	Lālāvaidyam	Skandasankara koth	”	Nagapore
107.	Līlāvilāsa Prahasanam	K. L. V. Sastry	”	Palghot
108.	Lōkaranjana Prahasanam	Srinivasacharya	Unpublished	Oriental Manuscript Library, Mysore
109.	Vançanaphalam	Chilukuri Rama bhadra Sastry	Published	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
110.	Vanabhōjana Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	“Pranava Paarijaata” 4-9
111.	Valgu Prahasanam	Ratnakara	-	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
112.	Vidyāmandira Prahasana	Sukhamaya Gango-padhyaya	Published	आधुनिक संस्कृत नाटक Vol. II p. 1250
113.	Vidhavāvivāha Prahasanam		-	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
114.	Vidhiviparyāsa Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	Published	Calcutta 1956

115.	Vinodaranga Prahasanam	Surendradwavidya	-	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक P. 24
116.	Vibudhamōhana Prahasanam	Harijivana Misra	Published	"Malayamaruta" -Kendriya Sanskṛta Vidyapeeth, Tirupati 1966
117.	Vimukti Prahasanam	Dr. Raghavan	"	Madras
118.	Vivāha Viḍambana Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	"	"Samskṛta Pratibha" 3-1
119.	Viṣṇōr-daśamāvatāra Prahasanam	Rasaraja	"	Samvit 183
120.	Vēṣṭana Vyāyōga	Viredrakumara Bhattacharya	"	Samskṛta Sahitya Parishat 1971
121.	Vaidhēyavikrama Prahasanam	Rajendra Misra	Unpublished	
122.	Subhagānanda Prahasanam	Vasudeva Narendra	Unpublished	
123.	Satabhāvōdaya Prahasanam	Krishnanandaacharya	"	New catalogues Catalogorum Vol. V p. 16
124.	Ṡatavārṣika Prahasanam	Jivanyayatirtha	Published	Calcutta 1972
125.	Sasivilāsa Prahasanam	-	-	
126.	Ṡilpa Prahasanam	Visnupada Bhattacharya	-	

127.	Śivarātri Māhātmyam	Chilukuri Ramabhadra Sastry	Published	Viswa Samskṛta Satabdi Grantha, Andhra Rajya Section
128.	Sṛngāra Nāradīya Prahasanam	Mahalinga Sastry		1-56 Sahitya Chandrasala Tiruvalangudu
129.	Ṣañkaravivāha Prahasanam	Visweswara	-	
130.	Samskāra Kautuka Prahasanam	-	Published	“Vidodaya” (Magazine) 1967
131.	Samihita Samīkṣaṇam	Subrahmanya Sarma	”	“Amṛtalataa” (Magazine) 1967
132.	Sarvadala Sammelana Prahasanam	Dr. Rudradeva Tripathi	”	”
133.	Sahṛdayānanda Prahasanam	Harijivana Misra	Unpublished	Anup Library, Bikaner
134.	Sāndrakutūhala Prahasanam	Krishnadatta	”	Bhandarkar Institute, Poona
135.	Sāgara Kaumudi Prahasanam	-	Unavailable	Bhavaprakasana of Saradatanaya
136.	Sairandhrika Prahasanam	-	”	Bhavaprakasana of Saradatanaya

137.	Sōmavallī Yogānanda Prahasanam	Arunagirinaatha	Unpublished	Govt. Oriental Manuscript Library - Mysore
138.	Snuṣavijayam	Sundararaja Suri	Published	
139.	Svargīya Prahasanam	Raveendranatha	”	
140.	Svargīya Hasana Prahasanam	Siddheswara Chattopadhyaya	”	Samskṛta Sahitya Parishat Calcutta-1977
141.	Swātantrya Mahāhuti Prahasanam	Jīvanyāyatīrtha	”	Introduction to Dhūrtanartaka
142.	Swātantrya Yajnāhuti Prahasanam	”		Indroduction to Dhūrtanartaka
143.	Swātantrya Sandhikṣaṇa Prahasanam	”	”	Samskṛta Sahitya Parishat Patirkaa Calcutta - 1957
144.	Swairāçānra Prahasana	Narayana Sastry	Unpublished	Preface to “Mythiliya Naataka” of the same Author.
145.	Samskṛta Prahasanam	Vasudeva Dvivedi	-	
146.	Hāsyakutūhala Prahasanam	Vittala Krishna Vidya Vageesa	Unpublished	Anup Sanskrit Library. Bikaner
147.	Hāsayakumudākara Prahasanam	Kalluru Venkatarama Sasty	”	Viswa Samskrta Satabdi Grantha - Andhras' Section

148.	Hāsyaçuḍāmaṇi Prahasana	Vatsaraja	Published	Devabhasha Prakasanam prayaga
149.	Hāsya Sāgara Prahasanam	Ramananda	Unpublished	Sanskrit University Library Varanasi.
150.	Hāsyārṇava Prahasanam	Jagadisa Bhattacharya	Published	Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, Varanasi 1963
151.	Hā Hanta Ṡārade	Skanda Syankar koth	”	Nagapore
152.	Hṛdayānanda Prahasanam	Kavipandita	”	संस्कृत में एकाङ्की रूपक p. 25

Appendix - II

Selecct Bibliography

SANSKRIT:

1. Alankaara Sarvasva: Ruyyaka
Ed V. Raghavan: The Sanskrit Book Depot, Delhi 1965
2. Agnipuraana (Kaavya Sasstriya Bhaag)
Translator and Editor: Dr. Ramlal Varma
National Publishing House, Delhi - 1969
3. Abhijnaana Saakuntala
V. Venkataraya Sastry & Bros. 1957
4. Kaavyaalankaara: Bhamaha
Ed. D. T. Tatacarya, Siromani - 1934
5. Bhaavaprakaasana: Saradatanaya
Ed. Y. Yatiraja Swamy, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 1968
6. Bhaavaprakaasana: Saradatanaya
Trans: J. Madhavarama Sarma - Andhra Pradesh
Sangita Nataka Academy, 1973
7. Citramimaamsaa: Appayya Diksita with Dharanathas Commentary,
Ed. Kalikaprasad Sukla: Vanivihar, Varanasi - 1965.
8. Dhvanyaaloka: Anandavardhana with English translation of
K. Krsnamurty: Karnataka University, Dharwar 1974
9. Dhvanyaaloka: Anandavardhana with Locana, Chowkambha
Sanskrit Series – Varanasi, 1940
10. Dasarupaka: Dhananjaya Ed. T. Venkatacarya: The Adayar
Library and Research Centre, Madras, 1963.
11. Dasarupaka: Dhananjaya with English Translation of
Charanatirtha Maharaj, Chowkhamba Publication, 1962
12. Ekavali: Vidyadhara with Telugu commentary of J.
Madhavarama Sarma: Abhinavabharati, Guntur, 1974
13. Kaavyaalankaara Sutra: Vamana with Telugu Translation of
Pullela Srirama Chandrudu - 1981
14. Kaavyaprakaasa: Mammata Ed. Hari Sankara Sarma:
Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1967
15. Maalavikaagnimitra: Kalidasa
Published by Ram Narayunalal Venumadhav Alhabad-1968

16. Naagaananda: Sriharsa - Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1956
17. Naatya Saastra: Bharata: with Abhinavabharati Ed M. Ramakrsna Kavi, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda, 1956
18. Naatya Saastra: Bharata
Ed. Vatukanatha Sarma and Baladeva Upadhyaya
Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1928
19. Prabodhacandrodaya: Krsna Misra: Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1971
20. Prataaparudriya: Vidyanatha
Ed. V. Raghavan: The Sanskrit Education Society, Madras, 1965
21. Saraswatikanthaabharana: Bhoja
Ed. Anuudoram Barooah: Publication Board, Assam, 1969
22. Srimad Vaalmiki Raamayaana: Valmiki
Ed. K. Cinnaswamy Sastry: Publisher: R. Narayana Swamy: Adayar.
23. Srngaarasarvasvabhaana: Nalladeeksita
Ed. Pandit Sivadatta Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay, 1925
24. Camatkaaracandrikaa: Visweswara: with commentary of P. Saraswatimohan: The Sanskrit Book Depot, Delhi-6, 1972
25. Prabodhacandrodaya: Krsnamisra
26. Ratnaavali: Sriharsa: Publisher: Ram Narayanalal Venumadhav, Alhabad-2: 1976
27. Rasatarangini: Bhanudatta, with commentary of Jivanathaji Oja, Bombay, 1971
28. Rasaratnapradipikaa: Allaraja
Ed Dandekar - Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1945
29. Rasaarnavasudhaakara: Singabhupala
Ed. Ravi Prasad Dwivedi - Sanskrit Parished, Sagar University, Sagar, 1969
30. Rasagangaadhara: Jagannatha with the commentary of Badareenath Jha and Madanmohanjha, Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan, Varanasi, 1964

31. Saahityadarpana: Viswanathakaviraja
Ed. Krishna Mohan Sastry, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1967
32. Saahityaratnaakara: Dharmasuri
Ed. K. Rajanna Sastry- Sanskrit Academy, Hyderbad, 1972
33. Samskrta Saahityaanusilana
Ed. Dr. Ramjt Upadhyaya - Samskrit Parishad Sagar University, Sagar
34. Srngaraprakaasa: Bhoja
Ed V. Raghavan Karnataka Publishing house, Bombay, 1940.
35. Subhaasitasudhaanidhi: Sayana
Ed. K. Krsna Murthy: Karnataka University, Dharwar, 1968
36. Vimsa Sataabdikam Samskrtarupakam: Ramji Upadhyaya, Sahitya Academy
37. Vakrokti Jivita: Kuntakam Ed. S K. De-Firma K L. Mukhopcdhyaya, Calcutta, 1961

And almost all the printed Prahasanas including those printed in Sanskrit Journals and some of the available manuscripts.

ENGLISH:

1. A Dictionary of Literary Terms: J. A. Cuddon: Indian Book Company: Andre Deutsch
2. A History of Sanskrit Literature: A. B. Keith: Oxford University Press, London, 1956
3. A History of English Literature: A. C Richett London
T. C. & E. C. Jack Limited, 1920
4. An introduction to the study of Literature: W. H. Hudson; G. Bell and Sons Limited, London, 1928
5. A Short History of English Drama: Dr Raghukul Tilak. Prakash Book Depot, Bereilly (U.P.), 1977.
6. Comedy: P. P. Mehta
Prakash Book Depot. Bereilly (U.P.), 1978
7. Contribution of Andhras' to Sanskrit Literature:
Dr. P. Sriramamurthy, Waltair.

8. Contribution of Bihar to Sanskrit Literature:
Suresh Chandra Benarji, A.T & K.P.J. Research Institute, Patna, 1973
9. Drama: H. H. Wilson
Chowkhama Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1962
10. Encyclopaedia of Britanica, inc Vol. IX, Printed in U. S. A. 1977 No.-0-8522-9-315-1.
11. English Comic Characters: J. B. Priestly
12. Every man in his humour: Ben Jonson
Educational Publishers Agra
13. History of Sanskrit Poetics, P. V. Kane
Motilal Banarasides – Varanasi, 1971
14. History of Sanskrit Literature: Krsnamaacaari
15. Kalidasa: A cultural Study: C. Kunhan Raja
Andhra University, Waltair.
16. Kalidasa: S. Nagaiah, Tirupati, 1978
17. New Catalogues Catalogorum I to X Vols.
University of Madras, 1969
18. Outlines of Sanskrit Poetics: G. Vijayavardhana
Chowkhamba Publication, 1970
19. Princton Encyclopaedia of Poetry & Poetics:
Ed: Alex Preminger The Maemillan Press Ltd., London, 1975
20. Humour in Memorium: George Mikes - London –
Rontledge and Kegan Paul, 1970
21. Sanskit Comic Characters: J. T. parikh, popular Book Store, Surut, 1962
22. Sanskrit Drama of 20th Century: Smt. Usha Satyarat
23. Shakespearean Comedy: Sen Gupta:
Oxford University press, New Delhi, 1977
24. Satire: Arthur pollard: Mathuen & Co., Ltd, London, 1980
25. Shakespearean Comedy: Dr. Reghukul Tilak
Prakash Book Depot, Bereilly, 1974

26. Some concepts of Alankara Saastra, Dr. V. Raghavan
The Adayar Library, 1942
27. The Sanskrit Drama: A. B. Keith
Oxford University press, London, 1923
28. The New Dictionary of Thoughts: Compiled by Tryon Edwerd, D.D. Revised and enlarged by C. N. Catrevas and Jonathen Edwards publishers, Universel Textbooks Ltd., London
29. The History of Literary Criticism: P.S. Sastry
Educational publishers, 1969
30. The Wit Wisdom and Humour of C. R. Reddy
Ed. K. Vasudeva Rao Cultural Forum, Guntur, 1982
31. The World's Best Jokes - Jasmin saran - J. S. Bright - Jagat P. P. Choudary
Publishers: Universal publication, New Delhi, 1978
32. Witty Bits - Brighton Edward Chrimas - Author and publisher - 40 Ship Street, 1922.

TELUGU:

1. Haasyatoranamu: Ed. polapragada Satyanarayanamurthy - Andhra pradesh Sahitya Academy, 1982
2. Manahaasyamu: Munimonikyam Narasimha Rao –
Andhra Saraswatha parasht, 1968
3. Naatyaastramu: Translated by Ponangi Srirama Appa Rao, 1959
4. Navarasa Gangaadharamu: J. Madhava Rama –
Navya Sahitya Parishat, Guntur, 1942
5. Naatyavedamu: Translated by J. Madhava Rama Sama, Andhra pradesh Sahitya Academy, 1961
6. Rasa Siddantamu - Aandhrula Varivasya: Dr. T. Rama krishnamurthy - Navodaya publishers, Vijayawada, 1981
7. Sheakspear Saahitya paraamarsa: Bucchi Babu
8. Samskrtha Bhaana Saahityamu: Dr. T. Ramakrishna murthy and S. Srinivasulu - 1979

9. Telugu Haasyamu: Mutnuri Sangamesam
10. Telugu Saametaalu: Ed. Viswanatha Satyanarayana, Andhra pradesh Sahitya Academy, 1959
11. Telugu Saahityamulo Haasya Rasamu: Smt. Vedavalli Tayaramma, Addepalli and Co., 1968
12. Telugu Naataka Vikkasamu: Dr. ponangi Srirama Appa Rao - Naatyamala prachurana, 1967

And the papers published in Telugu Journals like Bharathi, Andhra Sahitya Parisat Patrika etc.,

HINDI:

1. Aadhunik Samskruth Naatak Vol. I & II :
   Ramje Upadhyayaa, Sanskrit parishad-Sagar University, 1979
2. Aangrezi Saahitya Kosh: Damodar Agrawal -
   Bharatiya Jnanpith, 1972
3. Bhaaratiya Saahitya Kosh: Rajvamsa Sahaya Hira, Bihar Hindi Grandha Academy, 1973
4. Hindhi Naatya Darpana: Ramachandra Gunchandra - Delhi University, 1961
   Ed: Dr. Nagendra
5. Madhya Kalin Samskruth Naatak: Ramji Upadhyaya - Sanskrit Parishad, Sagar University.
6. Rasa Siddhaantha Aur Saundarya Saastra: Nirmala Jain - National publishing House, Delhi, 1967
7. Rasasiddhaant - Swarupa Vislesan:
   Dr. Anand Prakash Deekshith
   Raj Kamal Prakasana private Ltd., 1972
8. Samskrta Me Ekaanki Rupak: Dr. Veerabala Sama -
   Madhya Pradesh Hindi Grandh Academy, 1972.

Bio-Data

Dr. Suram Srinivasulu

Date of Birth	:	03-06-1951 @ Nellore, Andhra Pradesh
Son of	:	Kadayinti Seshamma, Suram Hanumanthaiah
Education	:	upto 20 yrs at Nellore
Primary Edu.	:	1st -3rd standard Aided Elementary School, Atthithota Agraharam
		4th-5th Aided Elementary School, Usman Saheb Peta
High School	:	6th-8th - V.R.High School
		9th - S.S.L.C. - Veda & Sanskit High School, Moolapeta - 1967
College	:	Sahitya Shiromani, Veda&Sanskit College, Moolapeta - 1971 (Sri Venkateshwara University First Place)
Private Study	:	P.O.L. 1975, Andhra Viswakala Parishat, Waltair Bhasha Praveena 1976, Andhra Viswakala Parishat, Waltair M.A. (Sanskrit) 1977, Andhra Viswakala Parishat, Waltair M.A. (Telugu) 1978, Andhra Viswakala Parishat, Waltair Ph.D. 1986, Andhra Viswakala Parishat, Waltair

Jobs

As Teacher	:	1971 - 1972, S.V.S.O.S. School Chekurapadu, Prakasham Dt., AP
As Lecturer	:	1972 - 1976, Oriental College, Eluru & Oriental College, Chinanindrakolanu 1976 - 1980, Oriental College, Ponnuru
As. Principle	:	1980-1990, Oriental College, Tadikonda 1990-2009, Oriental College Timmasamudram

Part Time Lecturer: Acharya Nagarjuna University, Guntur (1 year)

Visiting Fellow : Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetam, Tirupati (2008-09)

Adjudicator : For Several Dessertations Submitted for Ph.D

Awards & honours

- Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Academy Best Book Award - 1979 for 'Sanskti Bana Sahitya'
- Meritorious Teacher Award by Andhra Pradesh Govt.-1981
- Telugu Velugulu – Srinatha Peetam-1987
- Honor of Pushpa Kireetam, Chennai
- Ugadi Sahiti Puraskaram, Lalita Kala Parishat, Chirala-2001
- Bahumukha Prajna Award, Sahaja Sahiti, Chirala-2009
- Potti Sriramulu Telugu University Visishta Pratibha Puraskaram - 2011
- Srujana Sahitya Puraskaram, Addanki - 2013
- C.P.Brown Sahiti Seva Award, Bengaluru - 2020 November
- Smt Asuri Maringanti Sulochana Rangacharya Memorial Award – Siricona Best Poetry Award - 2021
- Telugu & Sanskrit Academy - Hamsa Award – 2023
- Sriman Krishnamacharya Kala Peetham Annual Award – 2023
- Ravilla Munemma Memorial Award - 2024
- Lot of honors and Titles in 'Avadhanas' at different places from 1970

Various Responsibilities

1. Member, Academic Council, Acharya Nagarjuna University.
2. Member, Academic Senate, Acharya Nagarjuna University.
3. Member, Board of Studies in Oriental Languages, Aharya Nagarjuna University.
4. Adhoc PG Board of Studies (Sanskrit), Acharya Nagarjuna University.
5. Resource Person, Refresher Courses
6. P.R.O., Oriental College, Resource Teachers Association (AP)

Publications

1. Mattha Vilasa Prahasanam - Telugu Anuvadam - 1974
2. Soumanasyam (Khandakavyam - Padyam) - 1979
3. Sanskrit Prahasana Sahitya (Vimarsha) - 1986
4. Hasya and Prahasana: A Critical Study (Ph.D..thesis) - 1989
5. Pooja Kusumam (Radio Drama..Sanskrit) - 1987
6. Karavalambam (॥ ॥) - 1985
7. Dhoorthanubhava bhana (Sanskrit)
8. Guruvararanjana bhana (॥)
9. Kavijanamandana bhana (॥)
10. Natasamagama bhana (॥)
11. Sunnitapu Trasu (Vachana Kavita) - 2002
12. Nikasha (Viswa Dharma Vani Editorials) - 2009
13. Rukminisha Vijayam (Telugu Commentary for Sanskrit Mahakavya)
14. Bhavani Bharati (Telugu Commentary for Aravind Ghosh Sanskrit Kavya) - 2019
15. Dasavatara Stotram (Telugu Commentary for Vadirajatirthar Sanskrit Kriti) - 2019
16. Jyotishmati Commentary for Shivanandalahari (in Sanskrit with Grammatical Approach) - 2020
17. Radha Sodashanama strotam (artha – tatparya in telugu) - 2020
18. Kalidasa's Kumara Sambhavam (Ashtama sarga – Telugu Commantary) - 2021
19. Dhartr Prashna athava Vedanta Mandanam (Sanskrit) - 2021
20. Sthavarajangamam (Telugu Poetry) - 2021
21. Etivaalu Jnaapakam (Telugu Poetry) - 2022
22. Rasavidya – Kavana Shilpa Sameeksha (Telugu) - 2022
23. Kaala Geeta (Telugu Poetry) - 2023
24. Vidupu Mudi (Telugu Poetry) - 2024
25. Sanskrita Bana Sahityam (Vimarsa) (Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Academy Award1979)
26. Bharata Nirukti – Nannaya Ruchiraartha Sookti - 1983
27. Bharata Nirukti – Tikkana Sarasokti
28. Bharata Nirukti – Errana Dharmokti
29. Janahita Vyakhya (Andhra Mahabharatamu – Virata parva) - 1989
30. Janahita Vyakhya (Andhra Mahabharatamu – Udyoga parva) - 2000
31. Janahita Vyakhya (Nirvachanotthara Ramayanam - Tikkana) - 2005
32. Vyasa Mahabharatam – Telugu Prose - 2010 (Vyasamahabharata - Translation) 20 Volumes (6000 pages)

33. Mahabharatamu – Telugu (Original Slokas with Telugu Translation – Geeta Press, Gorakhpur publication) A4 size.. 7 Volumes ..7250 pages - 2018
34. Sri Mahabharatamu (Sanskrit) Virata Parva (Commentary in Telugu – Geeta Press, Gorakhpur publication) 2005

(For 25 - 34 Co-Writer Dr. Tippabhatla Ramakrishna Murthy)

Others:

From 1973 Sanskti lessons, Sanskrit lectures, Sanskrit stories, Monoactions, Sukti Sudha, Sadvani, Telugu Literary lectures

From 1973 various writeups, Slokas, Poetry, Dramas published in magazines like Jagruti, Bharati, Natyakala, Andhra Patrika, Andhra Prabha, Rachana, Samalochanam, Gairvani, Sudharmaa, Atmajyoti, Samvit, Sanskrita Melanam etc.

As Editor of 'Viswa Dharma Vani' Magazine From 1991

Family Details

Wife : Sulochana

Daughters :
1. Madhavi, BE (Hons) M.S
   Son-in-Law : Kavuri Shyam Sundar
   Grandson : Sriharsha
   Grand Daughter : Gayatri
2. Dr. Sushama, M.B.B.S., D.O
   Son-in-Law : Dr. Praveen Kumar
   Grand Daughter : Vahini

Interests :
1. Learning & Teaching
2. Trying to achieve harmony between spiritual and physical lives and Analytical observation accordingly
3. Practical Approach